THE JAMES K. MOFFITT FUND.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

JAMES KENNEDY MOFFITT

OF THE CLASS OF '86.

Accession No. 196511 *Class No.*

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/wordsofjesuscons00dalmrich

THE WORDS OF JESUS

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

THE WORDS OF JESUS

CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF POST-BIBLICAL JEWISH WRITINGS AND THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE

BY

GUSTAF DALMAN

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG

AUTHORISED ENGLISH VERSION

BY

D. M. KAY, B.D., B.Sc.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND ORIENTAL LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

I. INTRODUCTION AND FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1902

BS2370
D3

MOFFITT

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION.

THE work here introduced to English readers is the result of studies which have been pursued during a long series of years. The aim of these studies has been to ascertain the meaning of the words of our Lord as they must have presented themselves to the ear and mind of His Jewish hearers. The author is well aware that the last word has not been said on not a few important and difficult questions treated in this volume; but his wishes will be fulfilled if his work serves to strengthen the conviction that labour in this direction is not fruitless, and must be done by many co-workers, if Christian Theology is to be brought into more precise relations with its historical basis.

As to the relation of the English translation to the German original, I have only to add that the English version practically forms a second edition of the work. A number of small errors have been corrected by the author throughout the whole book, and the introductory part has been partly rewritten and rendered more complete. The "Messianic Texts," which form an Appendix to the German volume, have not been included in the English edition. As they may be had separately from the publisher of the German edition (J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig), it seemed superfluous to reprint them here.

GUSTAF H. DALMAN.

LEIPZIG, 1*st April* 1902.

106511

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

THE Translator has endeavoured to furnish a faithful version of the German original, but is not responsible for the various positions maintained by the author. If the Gospel was first announced in the Aramaic language, it is obvious that the Greek versions of the Synoptists cannot be finally interpreted without taking due account of the Aramaic prototype. This factor is introduced by Dr. Dalman's line of research, and will be seen to contribute elements of great value in the minuter exegesis of the Gospels.

The Translator has to thank the Rev. Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, of Edinburgh, for the helpful interest he has taken in the process of translation, and for correcting the second proofs. In rendering into English the idea of the *malkuth Yahveh* (*Gottesherrschaft*, usually called "the Kingdom of God"), he hopes no inconvenience will be caused by the occasional use of "theocracy" as a shorter synonym for "Sovereignty of God." In citing the Talmud, b. before the name of the Tractate stands for Babylonian, j. for Jerusalem; a Baraitha is a tradition of the elders which did not happen to be incorporated in the authoritative collection of R. Yehuda ha-Nasi.

D. M. KAY.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Author's Preface to the English Edition v
Note by the Translator vii

INTRODUCTION.

I. Aramaic as the language of the Jews 1
II. The literary use of Hebrew 12
III. The Semitisms of the Synoptic Gospels 17
IV. Some Hebraisms and Aramaisms 20
V. Alleged proofs of a primitive Hebrew Gospel . . . 43
VI. Testimonies in favour of a primitive Aramaic Gospel . . 57
VII. The Problem before us and the previous studies in the same field . 71
VIII. The selection of the dialect 79

FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS.

I. The Sovereignty of God (Theocracy).

A. Sovereignty of Heaven, sovereignty of God, sovereignty . . 91
B. The Jewish use of the idea 96
C. The application of the idea of the Divine Sovereignty in the words of Jesus 101
1. The sovereignty of God is the subject of an announcement . 102
2, 3. The sovereignty of God is regarded as an approaching dispensation 106
4. The theocracy is an order of things under which men are placed 110
5. The theocracy is an order of things to which men attain . 116
6. The theocracy is a good 121
Jewish statements concerning pre-existence . . . 128
7. The sovereignty of Messiah 133
8. Concluding discussion 134
Appendix A.—Luke 16^{16}, Matt. $11^{12f.}$ 139
Appendix B.—Luke $17^{20f.}$ 143

II. The Future Age, the Age (Æon).

1. Its occurrence in the words of Jesus 147
2. Origin of the expression 148
3. The simple *ὁ αἰών* 154

III. Eternal Life, Life.

PAGE
1. Its position in the discourses of Jesus 156
2. The Jewish usage 156
3. The verbs connected with it 158
4. The simple ἡ ζωή 158
5. The significance of the idea 161

IV. The World.

1. Books in which the term is still unknown 162
2. The idea of the "world" in the Synoptists 166
3. Instances of the use of the idea "world" 169
4. The new world 177

V. "The Lord" as a designation for God.

1. Not a name for God to be found in common use . . . 179
2. Substitute for the Tetragrammaton (יהוה) 182

VI. The Father in Heaven.

1. The Israelitish-Jewish usage 184
2. The usage in the language of Jesus 189

VII. Other Divine Names.

1. God (ὁ θεός) 194
2. The Highest (ὕψιστος) 198
3. The Blessed One (ὁ εὐλογητός) 200
4. The Power (ἡ δύναμις) 200
5. The Holy One (ὁ ἅγιος) 202
6. The Merciful One (ὁ ἐλεών) 204

VIII. Evasive or Precautionary Modes of referring to God.

1. The Voice 204
2. Swearing by Heaven 206
3. Reward, treasures in Heaven 206
4. Written in Heaven 209
5. Before the angels, before God 209
6. Bound, loosed in Heaven 213
7. Heaven 217
8. From Heaven 219
9. Hosanna in the highest 220
10. From on high 223
11. Use of the Passive Voice 224
12. Amen 226
13. The Shechinah, the Glory, the Word 229
14. The Place 231
15. Concluding Statement 233

IX. The Son of Man.

PAGE
1. The linguistic form of the expression 234
2. "Son of Man" was not a current Jewish name for the Messiah . 241
3. "Son of Man" is no empty formula 249
4. "Son of Man" is a self-appellation of Jesus used exclusively by Himself 250
5. The meaning attached to the title by the Synoptists . . . 253
6. The sense attached by Jesus to the term "Son of man" . . 256

X. The Son of God.

1. The second Psalm in Jewish literature 268
2. The title "Son of God" as applied to Jesus by other persons . 274
3. The divine voice at the Baptism and the Transfiguration . . 276
4. Jesus' own testimony 280
5. The sense attached by the Synoptists to the title "Son of God" . 288

XI. Christ.

1. The term in Jewish usage—
(*a*) Derivation and form 289
(*b*) Signification and content 294
(*c*) The idea of pre-existence 299
2. The application of the name "Messiah" to Jesus . . . 303
3. The acknowledgment of the name "Messiah" by Jesus Himself . 305

XII. The Son of David.

1. The Jewish idea of Messiah's Davidic origin 316
2. The Davidic descent of Jesus 319

XIII. "The Lord" as a designation of Jesus.

1. The Jewish use of the term 324
2. The usage in the Synoptists 327

XIV. "Master" as a designation of Jesus.

1. The Jewish use of the term 331
2. The Synoptic use of the term 336

Index for Greek Terms 341

Citations of the Synoptic Gospels 345

Passages discussed in detail 350

EDITIONS OF TEXTS USED.

A. APOCRYPHA.

H. B. Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, i.-iii., 1887–94.
O. F. Fritzsche, Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Græce, 1871.
De Lagarde, Libri Veteris Testamenti apocryphi Syriace, 1861.
Sirach: Hebrew Text, 39^{15-49}, 11; edition of *A. E. Cowley* and *A. Neubauer*, 1897; ed. of *R. Smend*, 1897.
49^{12-50}, 22, ed. of *S. Schechter*, Jew. Quart. Rev. x. (1898) 197–206.
Tobit: Aram. Hebr. and Latin Texts, ed. of *A. Neubauer*, 1878.
Hebrew Texts, ed. of *M. Gaster*, 1897.
Supplements to Daniel: Aram. Text, ed. of *M. Gaster*, 1895.

B. PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.

Psalms of Solomon: ed. of *H. E. Ryle* and *M. R. James*, 1891; ed. of *O. v. Gebhardt*, 1895.
Book of Jubilees: translation by *R. H. Charles*, Jew. Quart. Rev. vi. (1894) 184 ff., 710 ff.; vii. (1895) 297 ff.
Book of Enoch: translation by *G. H. Schodde*, 1882; by *R. H. Charles*, 1893.
Greek text, *A. Lods*, 1892.
Assumptio Mosis: ed. of *R. H. Charles*, 1897.
Apocalypse of Baruch: Syriac text of *A. M. Ceriani*, 1871; translation by *R. H. Charles*, 1896.
2 *Esdras:* Syriac text of *A. M. Ceriani*, 1868.
Latin text, ed. of *R. L. Bensly* and *M. R. James*, 1895.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Greek text of *R. Sinker*, 1868, 1879.
Hebrew version (Naphtali), ed. of *M. Gaster*, 1894.
Sibylline Oracles: ed. of *A. Rzach*, 1891.
Testament of Abraham: ed. of *M. R. James* and *W. E. Barnes*, 1892.
Slavonic Book of Enoch: ed. of *W. R. Morfill* and *R. H. Charles*, 1896.

C. TARGUMS.

Onkelos: Sabbioneta, 1557 (in the original).
Jerusalem Targums to the Pentateuch: Venice, 1591.
Targums to the Prophets and Hagiographa: Rabbinical Bible, Venice, 1517; Venice, 1525; Venice, 1548; Basle, 1618.
Targum sheni on Esther: ed. of *L. Munk*, 1876; ed. of *M. David*, 1898.

D. LITERATURE ON THE LAW.

Mishna: ed. Riva di Trento, 1559; Mantua, 1561; Cambridge (*W. H. Lowe*), 1883.
Tosephta: ed. Sabbioneta, 1555; Pasewalk (*M. S. Zuckermandel*), 1881.
Jerusalem Talmud: ed. Venice, 1524; Tractate Berachoth, ed. Mainz (*M. Lehmann*), 1875.
Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Taanith, ed. Pesaro (*c.* 1511); Sanhedrin, Sota, Nidda, Erubhin, Zebhachim, Menachoth, Bekhoroth, Meïla, Kinnim, Middoth, Tamidh, Teharoth, ed. Venice, 1520–23.
Tractates Shebhuoth, Eduyyoth, Abhoth, Horayoth, Moed Katon, Yebhamoth, Erakhin, Temura, Kerithuth, Nedarim, Nazir, Teharoth, ed. Venice, 1526–29.
For the whole Talmud: ed. Vienna, 1840–47; Variæ Lectiones, *R. Rabbinovicz-H. Ehrentreu*, 1867–97.
Abhoth of Rabbi Nathan: ed. Vienna (*S. Schechter*), 1887.

E. COMMENTARIES (Midrashim).

Mechilta: ed. Constantinople, 1515; Vienna (*J. Weiss*), 1865; Vienna (*M. Friedmann*), 1870.
Siphra: ed. Venice, 1545; Vienna (*J. Weiss*), 1862.
Siphre: ed. Venice, 1545; Vienna (*M. Friedmann*), 1864.
Midrash Rabba on the Pentateuch: ed. Constantinople, 1512; Venice, 1545; Salonica, 1593.
Midrash Chamesh Megilloth: ed. Pesaro, 1519; Venice, 1545; Salonica, 1593.
Midrash on Canticles: ed. *S. Schechter*, Jew. Quart. Rev. vi. (1894) 672 ff.; vii. (1895) 145 ff., 729 ff.; viii. (1896) 289 ff.
Midrash Tanchuma: ed. Venice, 1545; Mantua, 1563; Wilna (*S. Buber*), 1885.
Midrash on Psalms: ed. Constantinople-Salonica, 1512–15; Venice, 1546; Wilna (*S. Buber*), 1891.
Midrash on Samuel: ed. Constantinople, 1517; Venice, 1546; Krakau (*S. Buber*), 1893.
Midrash on Proverbs: ed. Venice, 1546; Wilna (*S. Buber*), 1893.
Pesikta: ed. Lyck (*S. Buber*), 1868.
Pesikta Rabbati: ed. Vienna (*M. Friedmann*), 1880.
Pirke Rabbi Eliezer: ed. Venice, 1544.
Tanna de-be Eliyyahu: ed. Venice, 1598.
Yalkut Shimoni: ed. Salonica, 1521–26.
Yalkut Makiri: Yeshaya, ed. Berlin (*J. Spira*), 1894.

F. LITURGICAL WORKS.

Siddur: Seder Rab Amram, ed. Warsaw, 1865; Maimonides in Mishne Tora, ed. Venice, 1524; Siddur Hegyon Leb, by *L. Landshuth*, Königsberg, 1845; Seder Abodath Yisrael, by *S. Baer*, Rödelheim, 1868.
Machzor, German rite: ed. Cremona, 1560; Venice, 1568; Venice, 1714–19.
Polish rite: ed. Sulzbach, 1699; Amsterdam, 1736.
French rite: Machzor Vitry, ed. Berlin, 1893–97.
Sephardic rite: ed. Livorno, 1845–46.
Roman rite: ed. Bologna, 1541.
Romanian rite: ed. Constantinople, 1520.
Yemen rite: two manuscripts in possession of Dr. Chamizer, Leipzig, No. 1 of the year 1659, No. 2, 16–17 century.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE WORDS OF JESUS.

INTRODUCTION.

I. Aramaic as the Language of the Jews.

As the proof has been offered with comparative frequency of late [1] showing that the "Hebraists," [2] that is, the "Hebrew"-speaking Jews of Palestine, who formed a class distinct from the "Hellenists," did not in reality speak Hebrew but Aramaic, it seems superfluous to raise a fresh discussion on all the details of this question. Yet, while reference is made to my "Grammatik des jüd.-pal. Aramäisch" for information on all the Aramaic expressions that occur in the New Testament and Josephus, the most important sources of evidence now involved must here be shortly summarised.

1. *The custom, represented in the second century after Christ as very ancient, of translating into Aramaic the text of the Hebrew Pentateuch in the synagogues of the Hebraists of Palestine.*

M. Friedmann, Onkelos und Akylas (1896), 58 ff., 81 f., still holds fast to the traditional opinion that even Ezra had an Aramaic version of the Tora. In this he is mistaken. Yet the high antiquity of the Targum custom of interpreting is incontestable. About the year 200 A.D. the practice is so

[1] Most recently by *G. Meyer*, Jesu Muttersprache (1896), and *Th. Zahn*, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, i. (1897) 1–24.

[2] Acts 6[1] Ἑβραῖοι.

firmly established that the Mishna does not make it a matter for prescription, but concerns itself only with the more precise determination of details (Meg. iv. 5, 7, 11). In the third century it was recommended—by Joshua ben Levi to his sons—that one should not even in private read the text of the Law without the traditional translation.[1] It was not practical necessity that was the determining factor in this case, but the inviolable custom according to which Bible text and Targum were inseparable. There must, however, have been a time during which a pressing necessity created this custom, tending to depreciate the significance of the Bible text,—a time, that is, when the Hebrew text was not understood by those who frequented the synagogues. That even written Targums existed in the time of Christ may perhaps be concluded from the story[2] which represents Gamaliel I. as having caused a Targum of Job to be built into the temple while it was building, provided this Targum were written in Aramaic and not in Greek. Gamaliel II. also would appear to have seen a copy of the same Targum.[3] Of course it does not follow that such Targums were widely distributed, least of all that every one should have had them at home; only it is clear that in public worship the Holy Scripture was not read without the translation into Aramaic. This rendering, according to Meg. iv. 4, was required to follow each single verse in the Pentateuch, and every three verses in the Prophets.

2. *The Aramaic titles for classes of the people and for feasts attested by Josephus and the New Testament.*

Of these there may be named—

Φαρισαῖοι[4] = פְּרִישַׁיָּא (Hebrew would be פְּרוּשִׁים), "Phari-

[1] Ber. 8[a]; cf. *W. Bacher*, Agada der pälast. Amoräer, i. 141. That the Targum should therefore be also "read," thus implying the possession of written Targums, is, however, not to be inferred from the expression.

[2] Sabb. 115[a]; j. Sabb. 15[c]; Tos. Sabb. xiii. 2; Sophr. v. 15.

[3] See same passages except j. Sabb. 15[c].

[4] *Zahn*, Einl. in d. N. Test. i. 23, maintains that the plural פְּרִישַׁיָּא lies at

sees"; *Χααναίαι* (*Jos.* Ant. III. vii. 1) = כָּהֲנַיָּא (Heb. כֹּהֲנִים), "Priests"; *ἀραβάρχης*,[1] *ἀραβάχης* (ibid.) = כָּהֲנָא רַבָּא (Heb. הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל), "High Priest"; *πάσχα* = פַּסְחָא (Heb. פֶּסַח), "Passover"; *ἀσαρθά* (Ant. III. x. 6) = עֲצַרְתָּא (Heb. עֲצֶרֶת), "Pentecost"; *Φρουραία*,[2] *Φρουραί* = פּוּרְיָא (Heb. פּוּרִים), "Purim"; *σάββατα* = שַׁבְּתָא (Heb. שַׁבָּת), "Sabbath."

3. *The use of the Aramaic language in the Temple.*— In support of this is the old tradition that John Hyrcanus heard in the sanctuary a divine voice speaking in the Aramaic language, j. Sot. 24[b]; cf. Ant. XIII. x. 3.[3] In the temple, according to Shek. v. 3, vi. 5, the legends on the tokens for the drink-offerings and on the chests in which the contributions of the faithful were deposited were in Aramaic. As now given in the Mishna text, some, however, of the names are Hebrew. But the use of Aramaic in the other cases is so striking in matters of the temple service, that one must regard it as the sole language originally used in this connection.

4. *Old official documents in the Aramaic language.*— These are, first, the "Roll concerning Fasts," a catalogue of days on which fasting was forbidden, first compiled in the time of the rising against the Romans, 66–70 A.D.; secondly, the Epistles of Gamaliel II. (about 110 A.D.) to the Jews of South Judæa, Galilee, and Babylon. Both of these were destined for the Jewish people, and primarily, indeed, for those of Palestine. For the "Roll concerning Fasts," see my

the basis of the Greek form *Φαρισαῖοι*, because the ending *αῖοι* represents a Semitic final sound in i or ay; and that from פְּרִישָׁא there would have been formed *Φαρισᾶς*. This is not convincing; for *Φαρισᾶς* would have been unsuitable as the name of a party, and the Greek language forms with equal ease *Λαρισσαῖος* from *Λάρισσα*, and *Ἀθηναῖος* from *Ἀθῆναι*. But, of course, it is probable that the formation of the Greek *Φαρισαῖοι* depended on the frequently heard plural definite פְּרִישַׁיָּא. Besides, the analogy of *Σαδδουκαῖοι* must have co-operated, and that goes back to צְדוּקִי, definite צְדוּקָאָה, plur. def. צְדוּקָאֵי.

[1] *Wellhausen*, Isr. und Jüd. Gesch. 161, holds that *χαναράβης* was the original reading; but it is possible that we have here one of the intentional Græcisms of Josephus. *ἀραβάχης* was meant to suggest *ἀραβάρχης*.

[2] *Φρουραί* is due to a reminiscence of the Greek word *φρουρά*, plur. *φρουραί*.

[3] Cf. *Dérenbourg*, Essai sur l'histoire de la Palestine, 74; *Büchler*, Die Priester und der Cultus (1895), 62 f.

treatise "Aramäische Dialektproben," 1–3, 32–34; cf. Jüd. Monatschr. xli. 326, and Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 7 f. The Epistles of Gamaliel given in Aram. Dialektproben are attributed by the Palestinian Talmud Sanh. 18[d], and thereafter by Graetz,[1] Dérenbourg,[2] Neubauer,[3] and Büchler,[4] to the first Gamaliel; but this must be an error, as the four groups of Jews alluded to (Upper and Lower Galilee, Darom (South-west Judæa), and Babylon) point to a date after the destruction of Jerusalem.

5. *The language of the public documents* relating to purchase, lease-tenure, debt, conditional betrothal, refusal of marriage, marriage contract, divorce, renunciation of Levirate marriage. The Mishna gives the decisive formulæ of these documents, which were important for securing legal validity, for the most part in Aramaic, thus implying that this was the language commonly in use. References are given in Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 12.[5] As there is no rule prescribing the language in which such documents must be drawn up, it is not surprising that the Mishna should also sometimes mention formulæ in Hebrew, as for divorce, Gitt. ix. 3, 5; and for emancipation, Keth. iv. 12; ix. 1, 5 for the marriage contract. How unimportant the choice of language was, appears from Keth. iv. 12, where an Aramaic form is given for dwellers in Jerusalem and Galilee, while one in Hebrew is given for dwellers in Judæa, with no intention, let us say, of emphasising the distinction of language, but by reason of the varying contents of the formulæ.—The previously mentioned Epistles of the Patriarch Gamaliel II. and the Roll concerning Fasts should properly be also reckoned among the public documents.

[1] *Graetz*, Geschichte der Juden, iii. 373.

[2] *Dérenbourg*, Essai sur l'histoire, 242.

[3] Studia Biblica (Oxford, 1885), 49.

[4] *Büchler*, Die Priester und der Cultus, 63.

[5] Only the formula for "conditional betrothals," תנאי כתובין (*σύμφωνον*), is not mentioned there; see, however, j. Kidd. 63[d], 64[a]; j. Gitt. 49[a]; j. Er. 21[b].

The language used in a certain family register (מְגִלַּת יְחָסִין), found at one time in Jerusalem, is open to question. According to the statement of Levi, one of the Palestinian Amoraim (about 300 A.D.[1]), it was written in Aramaic; and at any rate one sentence from it is reproduced in this language. The contents, now distorted by additions, would, however, refer it at the earliest to the end of the first century. But in Yeb. iv. 13 Simeon ben Azzai (about 110 A.D.) says that he too had found a family register in Jerusalem, in which there was used concerning some one this formula in Hebrew — מַמְזֵר מֵאֵשֶׁת אִישׁ, "bastard of a wedded wife."[2] Whether this register was the one alluded to by Levi cannot indeed be affirmed with certainty; but it is probably the same, and its language therefore doubtful.

6. *The unquestioned adoption in the time of Jesus of the Aramaic characters in place of the old Hebrew in copies of the Bible Text.*

The change of character has the change of language as its natural presupposition. The usual citation from Matt. 5^{18}, implying that *ἰῶτα* was the smallest letter, is certainly inconclusive. Vav and yod were both represented at that period by a long perpendicular stroke. The yod was distinguished by having a small hook at the top, and was thus really larger than the vav. The original spoke, as in Luke 16^{17}, only of a single hook (*μία κεραία*), or perhaps of the hook of the yod, as in Shem. R. 9 (whereas Vay. R. 19, presupposing the later style of writing, mentions the yod itself). The mention of the *ἰῶτα* in Matthew would be intended for Greek readers. For them iota was actually

[1] See j. Taan. 68[a]; Ber. R. 98; cf. *Büchler*, Die Priester und der Cultus, 41 f.

[2] *H. Laible*, in *Dalman-Laible's* Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue, 30 f., incorrectly refers it to Jesus. The discussion treats merely of the definition of the term "bastard." In Yeb. 49[b] the discovered document is still further embellished with spurious additions.

the smallest letter. Instead of on Matt. 5^{18} stress must be laid much more on the fact that the Judaism of the second century possessed the Bible text only in "Assyrian," *i.e.* Aramaic handwriting,—a point of contrast with the Samaritans, and further on the fact that even the Alexandrian translation is already based upon Hebrew texts in this character.[1]

7. *The Syntax and the vocabulary of the Hebrew of the Mishna*, which prove themselves to be the creation of Jews who thought in Aramaic. *M. Friedmann* is right in saying in his Onkelos und Akylas, p. 88, that "the chief part of the Rabbinic vocabulary is in its forms of speech and its idioms Hebraised Aramaic."[2] In regard to the first point, it is specially noteworthy that the Imperfect with the Vav Consecutive has vanished from use, and that a tendency occurs to use the participle as a present tense.[3]

8. *The custom of calling the Aramaic "Hebrew."*—Josephus, indeed, showed himself (Ant. x. i. 2, xii. ii. 1) quite capable of distinguishing the language and written character of the "Syrians" from those of the "Hebrews." And yet between Hebrew and Aramaic words he makes no difference. According to Ant. i. i. 1, 2, *σάββατα* and *Ἀδάμ* belong to the Hebrew tongue, but *ἀσαρθά* as well (Ant. iii. x. 6) is a term of the "Hebrews." The "Hebrew" in which Josephus addresses the people of Jerusalem (Bell. Jud. vi. ii. 1) is even called by him (Bell. Jud. v. ix. 2) *ἡ πάτριος γλῶσσα*, though in the circumstances nothing but Aramaic can be looked for. Again, in the Johannine Gospel the Aramaic terms *Βηθεσδά*, *Γαββαθᾶ*, *Γολγοθᾶ*, *Ῥαββουνί* are called "Hebrew," 5^2 $19^{13.\,17}$ 20^{16}. Aramaic, too, must be meant by the "Hebrew tongue" in which Paul spoke

[1] See for this, *e.g.*, *S. R. Driver*, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel (1890), lxv ff.

[2] See also *A. Geiger*, Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischnah (1845), i. 3; *J. H. Weiss*, Mischpaṭ lĕschōn ha-Mischnā (1867), 2 f.

[3] *A. Geiger*, loc. cit. i. 40.

to the people of Jerusalem (Acts 21^{40} 22^{2}), and in which Jesus spoke to Paul (Acts 26^{14}). *Ἑλληνισταί* and *Ἑβραῖοι* were the names, according to Acts 6^{1}, of the two parts of the Jewish people as divided by language, although *Συρισταί* would have been the more precise counterpart of *Ἑλληνισταί*. But if it was possible to characterise Aramaic as "Hebrew," it is clear that Aramaic was the everyday speech of the Jewish people at this period, in so far, at least, as it was not Greek.

All the facts adduced do not justify us in making a distinction between Judæa and Galilee, as if Hebrew was at least partially a spoken language in the former. In an essay which much requires revision, "The dialects of Palestine in the time of Christ,"[1] A. Neubauer has advanced the following assertion: "In Jerusalem, and perhaps also in the greater part of Judæa, the modernised Hebrew and a purer Aramaic dialect were in use among the majority of the Jews; the Galileans and the Jewish immigrants from the neighbouring districts understood their own dialect only (of course closely related to Aramaic), together with a few current Hebrew expressions such as proverbs and prayers." Adequate proof for all three parts of this assertion is awanting. Neither the dialect of the Galileans, which was merely related to the Aramaic, nor the purer Aramaic of the Judæans, nor their modernised Hebrew, can really be demonstrated. That Aramaic had at least a distinct predominance in *Judæa* may be inferred with certainty from the place-names in Jerusalem and its environs: *Ἀκελδαμάχ* (חֲקַל דְּמָא); *Βηθεσδά* (בֵּית חִסְדָּא); *Βηθζαθά*, *Βηζεθά* (בֵּית זֵיתָא); *Γαββαθᾶ* (גַּבַּחְתָּא); *Γολγοθᾶ* (גֻּלְגֻּלְתָּא); *Ὄπλα*, *Ὀφλᾶς* (עָפְלָא); *Σαφείν* (צָפִין); *Χαφεναθά* (כְּפַלְתָּא).[2]

[1] Studia Biblica, Oxford, 1885, 39–74.

[2] The discussion of these words will be found in my Grammatik des jüd.-pal. Aram. It may here be added that *Γαββαθᾶ* (Gram. p. 108) is incorrectly explained. גַּבַּחְתָּא, which properly means the baldness of the forepart of the head, was a fitting name for the open space in front of the Antonia Castle which

In the same category comes also a Hebrew term, similar to the foregoing, which was applied to the piece of ground on the Mount of Olives where Jesus tarried on the night of the betrayal. Whether one adopts the reading *Γεθσημανεί* (= גַּת שְׁמָנִי for גַּת שְׁמָנִים), as I have done Gram. 152, or starting from the readings *γεσσημανεί*, *γησαμανεί* concludes for גֵּיא שְׁמָנִי (= גֵּיא שְׁמָנִים, Isa. 28[1]), the term is all the same Hebrew and not Aramaic. But it does not therefore follow that Hebrew was a language in everyday use. The fact that Rabbinic literature beginning with the Mishna represents men of the pre-Christian and Christian periods as often speaking Hebrew and not Aramaic, proves nothing as to the language actually spoken by these men. One might as well by the same kind of "proofs" produce a demonstration that the colloquial language of the Jews in Galilee had always been Hebrew. From the strongly expressed antipathy to Aramaic [1] on the part of Juda the first, the redactor of the Mishna, one must at once conclude that this language was extruded so far as possible from the old traditions. The more significant on that account are all the Aramaic testimonies from earlier times that remain despite this opposition. The Hebrew form of any tradition thus proves nothing at all in favour of the oral use of Hebrew at an earlier date. Büchler [2] may be quite right in holding that Aramaic was the language used in the temple and in the sacrificial service. But when he feels obliged to infer, because the priests speak Hebrew in the descriptions of the temple service given by the Mishna in the tractates Yoma, Sukka, Tamid, Middoth,

served as a place of execution. *Χαφεναθά* (1 Macc. 12^{37}) is not noticed in the Grammar. With this term may perhaps be compared the biblical בֵּין הַחֹמֹתַיִם (2 Kings 25^4) and Onkelos' כְּפַלְתָּא for מַכְפֵּלָה (Gen. 23^{17}); while the interchange of *n* and *l* is illustrated by the name *Ρουβῆλος* in Josephus for the biblical רְאוּבֵן, and *Ξένιος* (Ant. XI. v. 4) for the name of the month כִּסְלֵו.

[1] Sot. 49^b: "Wherefore should I use the Sursi in Palestine? Either the sacred tongue [Hebrew] or Greek!" On "Sursi" *vid.* Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 2.

[2] *A. Büchler*, Die Priester und der Cultus, 64 ff.

that therefore the Aramaic had been expelled from the temple during the revolt, 63–70 A.D., there is no sufficient basis for his conclusion. At all events, there is no ground for the opinion expressed by A. Resch,[1] that Hebrew was the language of the mother of Jesus, inasmuch as she belonged to South Palestine.

In regard to Galilee, however, Hebrew does not come seriously into question. During the rising of the Maccabees the Jewish population in Galilee was so inconsiderable, that 3000 men under Simon, about 163 B.C., had no other means of protecting them from their ill-disposed neighbours than by transporting them to Judæa.[2] John Hyrcanus (135–105) appears later to have conquered Galilee and to have forced it into Judaism, so that Aristobulus I. was able to continue the same process in Ituræa.[3] Jewish families must thereafter have established themselves in these parts again in considerable numbers and intermingled freely with the Judaïsed inhabitants, so that by the time of Josephus the chief element of the population of Galilee as a whole appears as "Jewish." Under these circumstances the Hebrew language was not to be looked for; and this applies also to the little Nazareth to which there is wrongly attributed an isolation from intercourse with the outer world. It had on the one side Ṣippori (Sepphoris), the then capital of Galilee, and on the other, in close proximity, the cities of Yapha and Kesaloth, and it lay on the important highway of commerce that led from Sepphoris to the plain of Megiddo and onward to Cæsaræa. The actual discourses of Jesus in no way give the impression that He had grown up in rural solitude and seclusion. It is true only that He, like the Galileans generally in that region, would have little contact with literary erudition. This implies, moreover, that from

[1] *A. Resch*, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte, iv. 224, Das Kindheitsevangelium, 323.

[2] 1 Macc. 5^{20-23}.

[3] Ant. XIII. xi. 3.

this side He did not come into contact with the Hebrew tongue. The Aramaic was the mother tongue of the Galileans as of the people of Gaulonitis, and natives of Syria, according to Josephus (Bell. Jud. IV. i. 5), were able to understand it.

The language of the prayers in private use and that of the benedictions which were woven into the routine of daily life, may possibly have been Hebrew. But the Kaddish prayer in Aramaic and the explicit avowal of the Mishna Sot. vii. 1, that, *inter alia*, the daily repetition of the Shema, the daily prayer, and the blessing (grace) at meals might be said in any language (בְּכָל לָשׁוֹן),[1] are weighty evidence against determining the usage as it really existed among the people in accordance with the linguistic form of the Rabbinic tradition. If, then, it was conceded that the Hebrew language was not to be insisted on even in reading the Shema, that is, in the symbolic fulfilment of the duty to occupy oneself with the Law which had to be performed daily by every Israelite, it is clear that a very pressing necessity must have existed for this concession. The Hellenists, who understood no Hebrew at all, may well have been the chief occasion for this. But as Hebrew could not be quite unintelligible to the "Hebraists," there was no hindrance, in their case at least, to the use of their mother tongue in prayer. That even in the third century in Palestine Aramaic was still much used in prayer, may be gathered from the deterrent urged against it by Johanan (died 279 A.D.), one of the Palestinian Amoraim. He put forth the statement that the angels did not understand this language, and were therefore unable to bring Aramaic prayers before God.[2] There is a discussion (Ber. 40^{b}) concerning the Aramaic blessing which

[1] This is the expression of the Mishna in the common text and in the Babylonian Talmud; in the Palestinian Talmud and in the Mishna (ed. Lowe) the reading is "in their language," בִּלְשׁוֹנָם; the sense, however, is the same.

[2] Sabb. 12^{b}; cf. *Bacher*, Agada der pal. Amor. i. 243.

the shepherd Benjamin, in Bábylon, used to say over his bread; not, however, owing to the language used, but because it did not contain the name of God. That synagogue discourses intended for the people should have been pronounced in Hebrew, is an impossible supposition for a period in which the Aramaic version of the Bible text was a necessity. Otherwise there must have been an interpreter side by side with the speaker. The more the scribes obtained unlimited control of the Jewish religious system, so much the more did divine worship adopt the form prescribed by the learned, and specially calculated only for themselves. During the progress of this transition the popular language was gradually extruded from public worship. In this connection, also, Jewish popular life before the year 70 A.D. must not be judged from the appearances created by the Rabbinic literature.

Not even in regard to the legal schools of the earlier times is it incontestably certain that their language throughout was Hebrew, and that, in particular, the legal decisions were always formulated in that language. We are told, at any rate (Eduyoth viii. 4), that a certain Yose, who indeed is incorrectly styled Yose ben Yoezer of Zereda,[1] pronounced his decisions as to clean and unclean in Aramaic. This Yose appears to have lived about 100 A.D. One might conclude that at least in his school Aramaic was the prevalent language.

From all these considerations must be drawn the conclusion that Jesus grew up speaking the Aramaic tongue, and that He would be obliged to speak Aramaic to His disciples and to the people in order to be understood. Of Him, least of all, who desired to preach the gospel to the poor, who stood aloof from the pædagogic methods of the

[1] The appellation is held to be genuine by *H. Klueger*, Genesis und Composition der Halacha-Sammlung Edujot (1895), 84. See, however, *A. Büchler*, Die Priester und der Cultus, 63, 84; *D. Hoffmann*, Mischnajoth, Eduj. viii. 4.

scribes, is it to be expected that He would have furnished His discourse with the superfluous, and to the hearers perplexing, embellishment of the Hebrew form.

II. The Literary Use of Hebrew.

The Jewish people has written in Hebrew in all periods. German, Spanish, Arabic may be the sole language of intercourse, while literary work is done as exclusively in Hebrew. So it *may* have been also in the period when Aramaic was dominant.

And we possess, in fact, some examples of Hebrew authorship from the centuries before and after the birth of Christ. A Hebrew original must be regarded as probable for the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*,[1] 2 *Esdras*,[2] the *Book of Jubilees*,[3] and for the Jewish groundwork of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[4] The same language may be assumed for the whole series of writings composed under the names of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, Baruch, and Ezra, and for the Psalms of Solomon, in so far at least as such works were written in any Semitic language. Who could without

[1] That I have in some respects serious misgivings regarding the considerations urged by *R. H. Charles* as proving a Hebrew original, see my notice of his edition of the Apocalypse of Baruch, Theol. Litbl. xviii. (1897) No. 15. The same reservation applies to Charles' conclusions as to the Assumption of Moses. Especially must his attempts at retranslation be pronounced almost throughout a failure. But in the affirmation of a Hebrew original he is right.

[2] See esp. *Wellhausen*, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi. (1899) 234 ff.

[3] See *E. Littmann* in Kautzsch's Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen, ii. 35.

[4] *M. Gaster*, The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch., Dec. 1893, Feb. 1894, believed he had discovered the original of the Testament of Naphtali; but the conjecture of *A. Neubauer*, Mediæval Jewish Chronicles, vol. i. p. xxi, that Jerachme'el is the translator of the apocryphal writings contained in the Bodleian MS. used by Gaster, holds good also for the Testament of Naphtali. From Neubauer's communications regarding Jerachme'el one does not expect from the latter Semitic originals that had disappeared, but selections from Western literature which was inaccessible to Jews. See also *F. Schnapp*, Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen, ii. 458 f.

hesitation have represented Moses or Baruch as the writer of a book in Aramaic? To Hellenists such a book might be offered without scruple, because the Hebrew original could not have been read by them. Among "Hebraists" it would be startling if, in place of the presumed Hebrew original, a mere Aramaic translation had come to light.

The *Book of Daniel* forms here no real exception. Its groundwork, comprising the contents of chaps. 1–6, has presumably been an Aramaic narrative of the experiences of Daniel and his comrades at the court of Babylon. A writing, in which visions were interpreted to the Kings of Babylon, used aptly enough the language current in the whole East at the time. The second part of the book, chaps. 7–12, gave — not less appropriately in Hebrew — visions which Daniel himself had had, together with their interpretation through an angel. The redactor may first have ventured to translate chaps. 1^1–2^4 into Hebrew, and chap. 7 into Aramaic, and by this means as well as by the corresponding contents of the prophecy he welded the separate halves into one whole. In chap. 2 the world-power is in decay when the Kingdom of God makes its appearance; in chap. 7 ff. it is in reality full of the greatest menace against the people of God (cf. $2^{42f.}$ with $7^{24f.}$). In chap. 7 is also to be noted the peculiar use of the Hebrew עֲלַיְתָא, occurring only in this chapter. That the Aramaic part did not begin originally with 2^4 is self-evident. Further additions to the Aramaic part would naturally be composed in Aramaic, so that in the Aramaic translation of the supplements to Daniel (Song of the Three Children, Daniel and the Dragon), which M. Gaster has published,[1] at least the choice of language is happily inspired; though it must not

[1] *M. Gaster*, The Unknown Aramaic Original of Theodotion's Additions to the Book of Daniel, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xvi. 280 ff., 312 ff., xvii. 75 ff. Gaster has extracted the pieces from the Chronicle of Jerachme'el, who himself declares at the outset that he had translated them from the Greek Bible.

be fancied that this really represents the original from which Theodotion translated.

In regard to the Book of Enoch, the question as to its original language is complicated owing to the different origin of its parts. A Semitic original is beyond question for chaps. 1–36. In this section the terms *φουκα*, 18^8, *Μανδοβαρα*, 28^1, *Βαβδηρα*, 29^1, speak in favour of Aramaic by reason of the ending in *-a*, though פּוּךְ is only known as a Hebrew word, and מדבר, "wilderness," can be equally good Hebrew. In 10^{17} *τὰ σάββατα αὐτῶν* stands where "their grey old age" was to be expected; but that is susceptible of explanation equally well through Heb. שַׁבָּתָם as Aram. שַׁבָּתְהוֹן or שַׁבְּתְהוֹן. In 10^9 *μαζηρέους* (cf. מְמֵזֵר) may also be Hebrew or Aramaic. Expressions clearly Hebrew are—*καὶ ἐγένετο*, 6^1 (from Gen. 6^1); *πρὸ τούτων τῶν λόγων*, 12^1; *φωνὴ βοῶν* (cf. קוֹל קֹרֵא), 9^2; as well as *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, 9^{10} 22^7; *ἐκ δεξιῶν* (= southwards), 13^7; and *εὐφρανθήσονται εὐφραινόμενοι* (= יִשְׂמְחוּ יִשְׂמָחוֹת), 25^6. An original in *Hebrew* must be assumed for chaps. 72–82 on account of the Hebrew names for the phases of the sun and moon, 78^{11}, and for the points of the compass, 77^1. As for chaps. 37–71, I can merely point out the Hebraising phrases "and it came to pass," 57^1 68^4 70^1 71^1; "and it will come to pass," 39^1 52^7; "before his face," $62^{2.\ 10}$ 63^9 65^6 66^3 69^{29}. In chaps. 83–90 the repeated use (thirty times) of the redundant "begin" is striking, and is at least not old Hebrew (vid. IV. 8 below, pp. 26 ff.). As for the remainder and the book as a whole, I do not venture to make a final pronouncement.

There can be no doubt that the First Book of Maccabees is derived from a Hebrew original. When Jerome in the Prologus galeatus speaks of having the book before him in Hebrew, one must indeed, in view of the prevailing ambiguity of his statements on such matters, be careful to see whether he has here, too, perhaps made no distinction between Hebrew and Aramaic. But the language of the book con-

firms his testimony. Its phraseology is that of historical narrative in the Bible, which the author has obviously imitated of set purpose. It will suffice to adduce—*εὑρίσκειν χάριν ἐνάντιόν τινος*, 10^{60} 11^{24}; *διδόναι κέρας*, 2^{48}; *φοβεῖν φόβον μέγαν*, 10^{8}; *πατάσσειν πλήγην μεγάλην*, 5^{3}, cf. 5^{34} 8^{4}; *κόπτειν κοπετὸν μέγαν*, 2^{70} 9^{20} 13^{26}; *ὀργίζειν ὀργὴν μεγάλην*, 16^{36}; *ἀνὴρ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ* (= one another), 2^{40}; *ἐγένετο ὅτε*, 5^{1} 7^{2} 9^{23} $10^{64.\,88}$; the frequent use of *εἰς συνάντησιν, εἰς ἀπάντησιν* = לִקְרַאת; *σφόδρα* = מְאֹד; *λέγων λέγοντες* = לֵאמֹר; *κατὰ πρόσωπον* = לִפְנֵי. All this is specifically Hebrew and not Aramaic.

The Aramaic *Book of the Hasmonæans*,[1] which is modelled after the biblical Aramaic, is in no way connected with the First Book of Maccabees, and is, together with its Hebrew version,[2] of much later origin. Of the Book of Tobit we now possess four distinct Hebrew recensions and one Aramaic;[3] but though M. Gaster believes he has what is nearly the original in one of the Hebrew texts published by him, it still remains possible that all these Semitic texts are only translations from the Greek, and that the hypothetical Semitic original is lost to us. When Jerome says that he had completed the Book of Tobit with the help of a Hebrew translation, which latter he himself had got made from a Chaldaic text, it is possible that this text too may have been a translation from the Greek, and may itself have been in Syriac. The same possibility will hold of the Chaldaic text of the Book of Judith which Jerome used;

[1] See especially the edition of *M. Gaster*, "The Scroll of the Hasmonæans," in Transactions of the Orient. Congress, Lond. 1891, ii.; and, further, *A. Neubauer* in Jew. Quart. Rev. vi. (1894) 570 ff., also Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 6.

[2] See, *e.g.*, *Baer's* Seder Abodath Yisrael, 441 ff.

[3] Two Hebrew recensions were printed in Constantinople 1516 and 1519; *M. Gaster* edited in 1897 two more in "Two unknown Hebrew versions of Tobit" (also in Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.); *A. Neubauer* published an Aramaic text (together with the Hebrew of 1516), "The Book of Tobit, a Chaldee Text" (1877), see also Gram. 27 ff., and *Schürer*, Geschichte d. jüd. Volkes,[3] iii. (1898) p. 180 f.

although in this case a Hebrew original is the most probable. Whoever wrote after the model of the biblical books would naturally—as we have said above—if a "Hebraist," have used the "Hebrew" language, but if a Hellenist, the Greek language. In no case, however, has the abridged Hebrew reproduction of the story of Judith, which we possess in a twofold form,[1] an immediate connection with the original of the book.

If we turn now to the question of the language of a primitive Semitic gospel, it must be said that some of the incentives favourable to composition in Hebrew at that time do not in this case come into action. Jesus had taught in Aramaic; and in that language the "Hebraists" must have been taught concerning Him in Christian public worship, if the address were to be intelligible to all. If, further, the substance of such an address were noted down for the Aramaic speaking "Hebraists," composition in Hebrew after the model of the biblical books was, of course, not inconceivable, especially as those Jews who could read were also able to understand Hebrew, yet the more probable course with material already formulated by oral delivery was to write it down in the language in which it was spoken, particularly if the record were designed to afford convenient and reliable material for further recital or public exposition. Even some centuries later, the gospel of the Jewish Christians, according to the express testimony of Jerome, was composed not in Hebrew but in Aramaic. Hence there is much to justify the view—unless decisive evidence to the contrary should be found in Church tradition or in the Gospels themselves—that a collection of the sayings of our Lord designed for "Hebraists," in other words, a primitive gospel (Urevangelium), was written in Aramaic.

[1] *Jellinek* edited one recension in Beth ha-Midrasch, i. 130 f., *Gaster* another in Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xvi. 156 ff.

III. The Semitisms of the Synoptic Gospels.

Not a little has been written on the "Hebraisms" of the New Testament since the first important investigation of them by Kaspar Wyss[1] and Johann Vorst[2] in the seventeenth century. But from the outset it has not been grasped with sufficient clearness that the Greek of the Jewish Hellenists must have been affected by Semitic tongues in several distinct ways. In the first place, it must be assumed that the Greek spoken from Syria to Egypt was in many particulars influenced, in no small degree, by the Aramaic language of the country; and, further, it holds true for that portion of the Jewish people that adopted Greek in place of its Semitic mother-tongue, that this mother-tongue had been Aramaic, and that the world of thought peculiar to the Jews, which had then to be apprehended in a Greek mould, had already been fashioned in Aramaic and no longer in Hebrew. The spiritual intercourse also which Jewish Hellenists continuously had with Hebraists in Palestine implied a constant interchange between Greek and Aramaic (but not Hebrew) modes of expression. Hebrew influence was active only indirectly: first, in so far as a Hebrew past underlay the Aramaic present of the Jewish people; secondly and in particular, because the Greek translation of the Old Testament had necessarily a powerful influence on the religious dialect.

In the case of the Synoptic Gospels of the Christian Hellenists, there has further to be added to the previously specified relations with Jewish Aramaic, the highly important consideration that the groundwork of the material elaborated by them had been originally created in Aramaic. And this holds equally true whether their basis presented itself to the

[1] *Kaspar Wyss*, Dialectologia sacra, Zürich, 1650.

[2] *Johann Vorst*, Philologia sacra, ii., Leyden, 1658, i., Amsterdam, 1665, with general title: De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti Commentarius, Amsterdam, 1665.

authors directly in its Aramaic form or already through the medium of Greek tradition, oral or written.

In these circumstances there can be no doubt that the Semitisms of the Gospels ought first to be looked for in the sphere of the Jewish Aramaic, and that only where this does not suffice for explanation, need it be asked how far Hebrew is to be held responsible for Semitisms. In the latter case a special examination is then required into the different possibilities involved. The material of the Synoptic Gospels might have partly or wholly been shaped in a Hebrew mould in which it became mixed with Hebraisms, and in this condition have reached the evangelists. A Hebraising influence, on the other hand, might also come into play after the material had already been moulded in Greek. During this phase such an influence is the less improbable, because in the oral presentation of the "gospel" at gatherings of the Christian community, as well as in any literary treatment applied to it, the Greek Old Testament furnished the readiest model. This version being the most important book read by the Christians in public and in private, the desire to give to the gospel a corresponding dress must naturally have existed; and the conception of the Canon among the Christian Hellenists was none so sharply defined as to cause scruples in assimilating the form of new devotional lectionaries to the older Scriptures.

It is a serious defect in previous studies of the Semitisms in the Gospels, that too little account is taken of these circumstances. P. W. Schmiedel complains in his new edition of "Winer's Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms," § 2. 1*c*, that the Aramaic constituents of the New Testament diction have not been sufficiently regarded. But he himself does not succeed in reaching any really tenable separation of Aramaisms and Hebraisms. Still less satisfactory is it with F. Blass, who calls special attention in his "Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch" (1896),

p. 4, to the Hebrew-Aramaic influence on the idiom, but makes no attempt to distinguish Aramaisms from Hebraisms; and in the Preface to his edition of the Gospel of Luke[1] he characterises as Aramaisms idioms which in some cases are equally good Hebraisms, and in others are pure Hebraisms and not Aramaisms at all. And how is it possible that J. Böhmer should still exclusively consult the Old Testament in his tractate, otherwise instructive in many respects, "Das biblische 'im Namen'" (1898), in which he aims at explaining linguistically and historically the variations *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* in the baptismal formula? In this very instance the key to the explanation of the expression is to be found in the usage of language among the Jews. Böhmer should at least have said why he looked for no information from that quarter.

A further deficiency in the current grammatical studies of New Testament Greek consists in the inadequate attention directed to the "Græcisms" of the Gospels, *i.e.* to the linguistic phenomena which have no immediate Semitic equivalent, and for which, therefore, the Hellenistic writers must perforce be held responsible. Previous translators of the Gospels into Hebrew have come to grief over these Græcisms, either because, like Delitzsch and, in a minor degree, Salkinson, they have refused to abandon the principle of a verbally faithful reproduction of the sacred Greek original,[2] or because they have not properly recognised the specific Græcisms, as appears to be the case with Resch, who was surely indifferent to any such consideration as that just mentioned.

Whosoever would know what was the Aramaic primary form of any of the Master's sayings will have to separate these latter Græcisms not less distinctly than the former

[1] *F. Blass*, Evangelium sec. Lucam (1897), xxi f.

[2] This is not mentioned as a censure. In this principle, so far as it is applied to a translation for *practical* purposes, I fully agreed with *Franz Delitzsch*, and was therefore able to act as editor of the revised 11th edition of his Hebrew New Testament, which appeared in 1892.

Hellenistic Hebraisms. Thus may be reached a verbal form which is at least not unthinkable in the utterance of Jesus, and which is most closely identified with the original Aramaic tradition of the apostles.

Even such *Aramaic* Hebraisms as the Targums present in great number, are not to be regarded as specially probable in the mouth of Jesus. Whoever compares the words of Jesus Himself with the hymns and discourses of other persons in the Lucan writings, will find it a peculiar characteristic of the style of Jesus, that Holy Scripture is cited but rarely, and only when it has to be adduced owing to a definite call for it, and that references to the letter of Scripture are confined to a very limited compass. Moreover, it is all the less probable that He should have spoken the Hebraising Aramaic of the Targums, inasmuch as no such practical use of it is anywhere to be found among the Jews. Even to Aramaic transmitters of His words we cannot therefore impute any tendency to Hebraise them, unless we are to assume on their part a purposeless, yet intentional, imitation of a Targum. The words of Jesus, purged of special Hebraisms of every kind, will accordingly have the highest probability of being original.

IV. Some Hebraisms and Aramaisms.

In order to inaugurate an investigation of the Synoptic Semitisms which will better satisfy the demands that must be made upon it, a number of these will now be discussed. Such phrases will be selected as either substantially define or are sufficient to define the general style of one or more Synoptists. The discussion of further details must be reserved till the examination of the special passages.

1. ἐλθών, ἐρχόμενος.

The participles ἐλθών or ἐρχόμενος are redundantly coupled with a finite verb by the three Synoptists, *but not by*

the Johannine Gospel.[1] Jesus says, Matt. 5^{24} *ἐλθὼν πρόσφερε*, "go, offer"; Matt. 12^{44} (Luke 11^{25}) *ἐλθὸν εὑρίσκει*, "it goes and finds"; Matt. 25^{27} (cf. Luke 19^{23}) *ἐλθὼν ἐκομισάμην*, "I should have gone and received"; Luke 15^{25} *ἐρχόμενος ἤγγισεν*, "he came and drew nigh." A kindred use is *πορευθεὶς ἐκολλήθη*, "he went and joined himself to," Luke 15^{15}. The narrative also makes use of such expressions: Matt. 2^{23} *ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν*, "he went and dwelt"; Matt. 15^{25} *ἐλθοῦσα προσεκύνει* (Mark 7^{25} *εἰσελθοῦσα προσέπεσεν*), "she came and fell down." This idiom corresponds to the redundant הָלַךְ and בּוֹא of the Old Testament; see, *e.g.*, Judg. 19^{10} וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיָּבֹא, "he went and came"; Hos. 5^{15} אֵלְכָה אָשׁוּבָה, "I will go (and) return"; 1 Sam. 20^{1} וַיָּבֹא וַיֹּאמֶר, "he came and said." In the Book of Enoch (Greek text) may be compared especially the conjunction of *πορεύεσθαι* with *εἰπεῖν*, 12^{4} $13^{1.3}$ 15^{2}; see also *πορεύου καὶ δήλωσον*, 10^{11}; *πορευθεὶς ἐκάθισα*, 13^{7}. In Jewish Aramaic this idiom is also common. Exx.: אָזֵיל וּמִתְעֲבֵד, "he goes and becomes," Vay. R. 25; יֵיזֵיל יְמוּת, "let him go and die," j. Ter. 45[c]; יֵיזֵיל וְיִשְׁתַּהֵיד, "let him go and testify," j. R. h. S. 58[d]; אֵיזֵיל וּמְשֵׁיזֵיב, "I go and rescue," j. Ter. 46[b]; אֲתָא מֵעֲבַד כֵּן, "he came so to do," j. Khall. 60[b]; אֲתָא שְׁאַל, "he came and asked," j. Shebi. 39[a]; יֵיתֵי וְיִסַּב, "let him come and marry," Ber. R. 65; אֲזָלַת וְאִתְנְסֵבַת, "she went and married," Ber. R. 17.

2. *ἀφείς, καταλιπών.*

The juxtaposition of *καταλιπών* and *ἀφείς* with a term signifying departure, where the idea of "leaving" can in no way be emphasised, occurs in the narrative of Matthew and Mark, *but not in Luke and John.* Examples: Matt. 13^{36} *ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους ἦλθεν*, "He left the people and went"; 22^{22} *ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθαν* (this also in Mark 12^{12}), "they left Him and went away"; Mark 8^{13} *ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς—ἀπῆλθεν* (Matt. 16^{4} *καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν*), "He left them and

[1] John 11^{17} *ἐλθών* is indispensable; the reading, however, is doubtful.

departed"; Matt. 21[17] *καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν*; see also Mark 4[36]. In the Old Testament this is not a usual mode of diction. Salkinson renders *ἀφιέναι* by עָזַב, Delitzsch sometimes by הִנִּיחַ. But the former signifies in the Old Testament "to desert, leave in the lurch," the latter "to leave or let alone," and neither the one nor the other is employed in idioms like those above quoted. This is the case, however, in Jewish Aramaic: j. Sabb. 8[c] שַׁבְקֵיהּ וַאֲזַל לֵיהּ, "he left him and went on"; j. Taan. 66[c] שַׁבְקוּנֵיהּ וַאֲזָלוּ לוֹן, "they left him and went away." From these instances it may also be seen how in similar cases *ἀπῆλθεν* standing by itself, which cannot be rendered into Hebrew merely by וַיֵּלֶךְ, presupposes the use of the popular *Dativus commodi* of Jewish Aramaic.[1]

3. *καθίσας.*

In certain actions of a sedentary kind the evangelists usually make superfluous mention of the posture. Examples: *καθίσαντες συνέλεξαν*, "they sat down and collected together," Matt. 13[48]; *καθίσας — ἐδίδαξεν*, "He sat down and taught," Luke 5[3]; *καθίσας ψηφίζει*, "he sits down and reckons," Luke 14[28]; *καθίσας—βουλεύσεται*, "he will sit down and consult," Luke 14[31]; *καθίσας—γράψον*, "sit down and write," Luke 16[6]. Of the same nature is the instance where it is said of Levi that Jesus saw him "sitting" (*καθήμενον*) at the receipt of custom, Matt. 9[9] (Mark 2[14], Luke 5[27]). In quite the same way it is said, Judg. 19[6] וַיֵּשְׁבוּ וַיֹּאכְלוּ, "and they sat down and ate," for to the narrator the "sitting" is an immaterial concomitant. Again, the "sitting and judging" or "sitting and ruling," as to which Joel 4[12], Zech. 6[13] are to be compared with Matt. 19[28] (Luke 22[30]), falls into the same class. In the Jewish Aramaic we find יָתִיב מְשַׁתָּעֵי, "He sat and recounted," Est. R. 3[4]; הַווֹ יָתְבִין פָּשְׁטִין, "they sat and studied," Ber. R. 17; הֲוָה יָתִיב מְתַנֵּי, "He sat and taught," j. Ber. 6[a].

[1] See my Gramm. d. j.-pal. Ar. 178.

4. ἑστώς, σταθείς.

Standing is the posture during prayer. Thus it is said, Matt. 6[5] ἑστῶτες προσεύχεσθαι, "to stand and pray"; Mark 11[25] ὅταν στήκετε προσευχόμενοι, "when ye stand and pray"; Luke 18[11] σταθείς—προσηύχετο, "he stood and prayed." In the Old Testament, 1 Kings 8[22], Neh. 9[4], it is also implied that standing was the usual attitude at prayer; it is not, however, a regular phrase to say, "he stood and prayed." On the other hand, contrast מְצַלֵּי קָאִים, "he stood praying," j. R. h. S. 58[b]; קָאִים לְצַלָּאָה, Est. R. 3[4].

In the same way ἵστημι is quite without force in: εἱστήκεισαν κατηγοροῦντες, "they stood and accused," Luke 23[10]; εἱστήκει — θεωρῶν, "the people stood beholding," Luke 23[35]; cf. ἑστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος, "standing and warming himself," John 18[18. 25]. Further, we have from the Old Testament: וְעָמְדוּ זָרִים וְרָעוּ, "and strangers shall stand and feed," Isa. 61[5]; and from the rabbinical literature, הֲוָה קָאִים וְחָצֵר, "he stood and reaped," Vay. R. 22; עָמְדוּ וְאָמְרוּ, "they stand and say," Mechilt., ed. Friedm. 45[b].

5. ἀναστάς, ἐγερθείς.

A redundant ἀναστάς is found in the narrative of the Synoptists, *but not in John.* It is found with ἀκολουθεῖν, Matt. 9[9] (Mark 2[14], Luke 5[28]); ἀπέρχεσθαι, Mark 7[24]; ἔρχεσθαι, Mark 10[1. 50] (ἀναπηδήσας), Luke 15[20]; πορεύεσθαι, Luke 1[39]; ἐκβάλλειν, Luke 4[29]; εἰσέρχεσθαι, Luke 4[38]; διακονεῖν, Luke 4[39]; ἄγειν, Luke 23[1]; τρέχειν, Luke 24[12]; ὑποστρέφειν, Luke 24[33]. Here also is to be reckoned ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων, Luke 10[25]. The synonymous ἐγερθείς is seen in Matt. 2[13. 14] (with παραλαμβάνειν), and in Matt. 9[19] (with ἀκολουθεῖν). In words spoken by Jesus it is found with πορεύεσθαι, Luke 15[18. 20], 17[19]. A glance at the examples specified by Hebrew Concordances for the terms וַיָּקָם, וְתָקָם, וַיָּקוּמוּ, shows that this is a well-established Old Testament idiom. See also 1 Macc.

9^{44}, Book of Enoch 54^{3}, $89^{47.\,48}$. In view of this fact, it is hard to see how Blass in the Preface to his "Evangelium secundum Lucam" (1897), p. xxiii, can without more ado class it as an Aramaism. Still it is true that the same mode of speech is quite possible in Aramaic. Examples are: קָמוּ—לְמִבְנָא, "they stood up to build," Ezra 5^{1}; קָם לֵיהּ מְצַלֵּי, "he stood up to pray," j. R. h. S. 58^{b}; קָם וַאֲכַל לֵיהּ, "he stood up and devoured him," Vay. R. 22; קָם וְהַב לֵיהּ, "he stood up and gave him," Ech. R. i. 4; קָמוּן—וְאָרְגִין, "they stood up and protested," j. Keth. 30^{d}; קָמוּ—וּמְחוֹנֵיהּ, "they stood up and beat him," j. Yeb. 15^{a}. The Imperative קוּם is common for the mere interjection "up!" *e.g.* קוּם רְכוֹב, "up! ride," Vay. R. 28; קוּם אִתְהַלֵּךְ, "up! go," j. Bikk. 65^{d}; קוּם עֲבוֹד עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה, "up! worship idols," j. Ab. z. 39^{b}.

6. *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.*[1]

It is a well-known peculiarity of Hebrew narrative style that a speech is introduced not simply by וַיֹּאמֶר, "and he said," or וַיִּקְרָא, "he called," but by prefixing to these וַיַּעַן, "and he answered." The same mode of reporting prevails also in 1 Macc., Tobit, Book of Enoch,[2] Apocalypse of Baruch, 2 Esdras, Assumptio Mosis; it is conspicuously rare, however, in the Book of Jubilees and in Judith, and occurs occasionally in the Second Book of Maccabees. The Synoptists have the same mode of expression, and John's Gospel is here no exception. In the words spoken by Jesus it is found in Matt. $21^{29.\,30}$ 25^{12} (cf. ver. 9) $^{26.\,37.\,40.\,44.\,45}$, Luke 11^{7} 13^{25} 15^{29}. In these instances *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* is the formula most used; in Mark 7^{28} occurs also *ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει*, the two finite verbs being set side by side, and this latter is the formula nearly always used in the Johannine Gospel. *ἀποκρίνεσθαι* may also be made the principal verb to which the participle

[1] *J. Vorstius*, De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti, ii. (1658) 173–176; *D. Schilling*, De Hebraismis Nov. Test. (1886) 165.

[2] See especially Enoch 1^{2} 6^{4} 15^{1} 21^{9} $22^{7.\,9}$ 24^{6} $25^{1.\,3}$ 27^{1}.

λέγων is attached, see Matt. $25^{9.\,37.\,44.\,45}$, Mark 3^{33} 5^{9} 9^{38} 15^{9}, Luke 3^{16} 4^{4}, John 1^{26} 10^{33} 12^{23}. Moreover, the formula also occurs where no explicit question has preceded, see Matt. 11^{25} 17^{4} (Mark 9^{5}) 26^{63} 28^{5}, Mark 10^{51} 11^{14} 12^{35}, Luke 1^{60} 13^{14} 14^{3}, John $5^{17.\,19}$.

The Hebrew idiom is naturally copied both by the LXX and by the Targums; but even in biblical Aramaic עָנָה וְאָמַר, "he answered and said," is frequently employed. In the later Jewish Aramaic this formula is quite unknown. The Aramaic Scroll of the Hasmonæans, the style of which is modelled on the Book of Daniel, is singular in having it eleven times. Direct speech is introduced by the simple אמר. Even in conversations which are considerably prolonged, no further introduction is added. The word for "answer" in Galilean Aramaic אֲגִיב is rarely used. In Ech. R. i. 4; j. Erub. 18^{d} it is conjoined with אֲמַר, but not so as to constitute a persistent formula. אֲתֵיב, the word for "answer" used by Onkelos, appears to be as yet a learned term for "making good an objection." Probability supports the view that the formula in question was unknown in genuine Aramaic. In that case the evangelists can have borrowed it only from the Hebrew either directly or through the medium of the Greek Bible.

7. ἐλάλησεν (εἶπεν)—λέγων.

The circumstantially precise Hebrew phrase וַיְדַבֵּר אֶל פ׳ לֵאמֹר, "and he spoke to . . . and said," is likewise foreign both to the biblical Aramaic and to the later Jewish-Aramaic dialects. Aramaic, it is true, has the word מַלֵּל for "speak" alongside of אֲמַר; but the use of מַלֵּל is essentially narrower than that of the Hebrew דִּבֵּר. It is applied, indeed, as the introduction to a direct discourse, Dan. 6^{22} אֱדַיִן דָּנִיֵּאל עִם מַלְכָּא מַלֵּל, "then spake Daniel to the king, saying." But no parallel to this is found in the later literature.[1] Similarly

[1] Book of Enoch 21^{5} seems, however, to presuppose it: וּיֹאמֶר אֵלַי וְדַבֵּר אֵלַי.

in the single instance Ezra 5[11] the Hebrew לֵאמֹר is imitated by לְמֵמַר, whereas elsewhere for similar cases there is used only a finite verb coupled by ו, or a participle. When the Targums habitually render דִּבֶּר by מַלֶּל, and לֵאמֹר by לְמֵימַר, this should be pronounced a Hebraism; nor can it be otherwise regarded when the evangelists sometimes have recourse to the corresponding Greek expression of the LXX.

ἐλάλησεν—λέγων is found Matt. 23[1f.] 28[18], Luke 24[6f.], Acts 8[26]; εἶπεν—λέγων (εἶπαν—λέγοντες), Mark 8[28] 12[26] (discourse of Jesus), Luke 14[3]. Other instances are susceptible of a different explanation, viz. Matt. 14[27] (Mark 6[50]), because emphasis may be laid on the fact that Jesus, hitherto silent as He moved over the lake, then addressed His disciples, and Matt. 13[3] 22[1] because λαλεῖν (λέγειν) ἐν παραβολαῖς forms one composite expression. The expression accordingly is not a common one; further, it is never attested by more than one of the Synoptists in the same connection. Its occurrence also in Acts 26[31] and John 8[12] is a warning against hasty inferences.

Nevertheless λέγων must not in every case be referred without further examination to the Hebrew לֵאמֹר. The latter can be coupled with numerous verbs of calling, asking, reminding, teaching, charging, murmuring, etc. But Aramaic, too, has similar conjunctions: גְּזַר וַאֲמַר, "he decided and said," j. Ab. z. 44[d]; בָּרִיךְ וַאֲמַר, "he blessed and said," j. Ber. 11[b]; הֲוָה מַכְרֵיז וְאָמַר, "he announced and said," j. Yeb. 12[d]; אַסְהֵיד וְאָמַר, "he testified and said," Vay. R. 34.

8. ἤρξατο, ἤρξαντο.

The use of ἤρξατο, ἤρξαντο with an infinitive following, when nothing at all is to be said of any further development of the action thus introduced, is one of the peculiarities that mark the narrative style of all three Synoptists, John having it only once (13[5]), where it is perhaps due to the influence of the kindred passage Luke 7[38]. In Matthew it

occurs twelve times, in Mark twenty-six times, and in Luke twenty-six times. In words spoken by Jesus it is found Matt. 18^{24} 24^{49} (Luke 12^{45}), Luke $13^{25.\,26}$ $14^{9.\,18.\,29}$ $15^{14.\,24}$ 21^{28} 23^{30}. Further, this phrase occurs outside narrative passages in the forms *ἄρξῃ*, *ἄρξησθε*, *ἄρξεσθε*. The expression is obviously quite conventional. It is altogether foreign to the Old Testament, but in chaps. 85–90 of the Book of Enoch it is found with abnormal frequency. Salkinson has ignored it in Luke 3^{8} 13^{25} $14^{9.\,29}$ 15^{24}, but elsewhere has used הֵחֵל as equivalent. Similarly Delitzsch substitutes other turns of expression in Luke 3^{8} $14^{9.\,29}$, while in the other cases he also has recourse to הֵחֵל. Resch[1] entirely abandons the region of what is linguistically admissible by inserting הוֹאִיל as equivalent even in the historical narrative, as if a volition or determination to do something were to be expressed. And the statement of the same writer, that this הוֹאִיל "belongs very specially to the epic style of narration in the Old Testament," is incomprehensible. But all conjecture is rendered needless in this case by the fact that the Palestinian-Jewish literature uses the meaningless "he began" in the same fashion. The corresponding Aramaic term is the common word for "to begin," שְׁרִי, Pael of שְׁרָא, "to loosen"; in Hebrew הַתְחִיל, derived from תְּחִלָּה, "a beginning," is its substitute. For שְׁרִי see, *e.g.*, j. Ber. 2^{c}, 14^{b}; j. Shebi. 35^{b}; and for הַתְחִיל, j. Ber. 7^{d}, 12^{b}, 13^{b}; j. Pes. 33^{a}; Koh. R. v. 10. No example is known to me which would correspond to the use of *ἄρχομαι* in direct speech. But if שְׁרִי coupled with a participle had become practically meaningless, it is easy to see why we should have: "ye will begin to stand without, — to say" (Luke $13^{25.\,26}$), and "begin not to say" (Luke 3^{8}). This was, of course, very little different from the mere "ye will stand,—say," "say not." When we find in Matt. 3^{9} *μὴ δόξητε λέγειν* in place of *μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν* in Luke 3^{8}, this is only a *constructio ad sensum* variant in better Greek, which could also, however,

[1] Aussercanon. Paralleltexte, iii. 9.

have been expressed in Aramaic. Even in Luke 14^{9}, where Cod. D has omitted *ἄρξῃ*, there is hardly any real difference in the feeling of the writer between *ἄρξῃ—κατέχειν*, "thou shalt begin to take," and the simple "thou shalt take." Still it may here be recalled that strangely enough the Hebrew הוֹאִיל is in most cases rendered in the Targums by שְׁרִי,—as in the LXX by *ἄρχομαι*,—so that שְׁרִי may thus express the idea of "acquiescing in, consenting to." See Onk. Deut. 1^{5}; Trg. Josh. 7^{7} 17^{12}, Judg. $1^{27.\,35}$ 19^{6}, 2 Sam. 7^{29}, 2 Kings 5^{23} 6^{3}. This sense is *possible* also in Luke 14^{9}.

9. *εὐθέως εὐθύς, παραχρῆμα.*

The adverb *εὐθέως, εὐθύς*—the latter being the undisputed reading in a few passages only—is used by Mark forty-five times, by Matthew eighteen times, by Luke[1] eight times, and by John seven times. The synonymous *παραχρῆμα* is found twice in Matthew and ten times in Luke, Matthew and Luke thus having the adverb for "straightway" with about equal frequency though only half as often as Mark. In words spoken by Jesus, *εὐθέως* (*εὐθύς*) is found Mark 4^{5} (Matt. 13^{5}) $4^{15.\,16.}$ (Matt. 13^{20}) $^{17.}$ (Matt. 13^{21}) ^{29} $11^{2.}$ (Matt. 21^{2}) ^{3} (Matt. 21^{3}), Matt. 24^{29} 25^{15}, Luke 12^{54} 14^{5} 17^{7} 21^{9}. Salkinson has recourse here to terms for "suddenly, quickly," such as פִּתְאֹם, בִּרְגַע, בִּרְגַע זֶה, עַד מְהֵרָה, or to the verb מָהַר. Delitzsch, too, has sought by various Hebrew expressions to do justice to the awkward *εὐθέως*. Resch has frequently expelled it from the text, but has occasionally used פִּתְאֹם. The Old Testament has, in fact, nothing corresponding. It is true also that the rabbinic literature does not exhibit any such usage *with the same frequency;* but there can be no doubt that its common use of מִיַּד, יַד מִן[2] represents the Aramaic prototype presupposed by the evangelists; see j. Ned. 41^{c}; j. R. h. S. 58^{a};

[1] In *Vogel,* Zur Charakteristik des Lukas (23), it is incorrectly stated that Luke has *εὐθέως* only once, elsewhere constantly *παραχρῆμα.*

[2] This appears more appropriate than בֵּין, which, especially in conjunction with אֲשֶׁר or דְּ, usually stands for "as soon as."

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Vay. R. 22; Jerus. I. Gen. 1^3, Ex. 19^{17}; Hebr. j. Pes. 33^a (*bis*); Ab. z. iv. 4. This מִיָּד does not mean "suddenly," but "without delay, forthwith, immediately thereafter," agreeably with the sense of *εὐθύς* and *παραχρῆμα* in the Gospels. It can generally be substituted where these occur.[1] That Matthew and Luke restricted its use is conceivable enough. Its excessive frequency in Mark must depend on the particular predilection of the author, and is due probably to Greek rather than Jewish-Aramaic influence.

10. *πρόσωπον*.

κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος, "in presence of any one," Luke 2^{31}, Acts 3^{13}, cf. LXX 1 Chron. 28^8 (לְעֵינֵי). The phrase, however, is also proper to classical Greek, and is therefore no Hebraism. In Hebrew לְאַפֵּי might also be used, as in 1 Sam. 25^{23}; in Aramaic, עַל אַפֵּי or בְּאַפֵּי, Gram. d. j.-pal. Aram. 183.

πρὸ προσώπου τινός, "before any one," is found in an Old Testament citation Mark 1^2, Matt. 11^{10} (Luke 7^{27}), in allusion to an Old Testament phrase Luke 1^{76}, in narrative Luke 9^{52} 10^1. It corresponds to the Hebrew לִפְנֵי. Theodotion, however, uses this phrase to reproduce לָקֳבֵל, Dan. 2^{31} (LXX *ἐναντίον*). One must not therefore necessarily predicate a Hebrew derivation for *πρὸ προσώπου* (which Luke also employs in Acts 13^{24}), although the idiom is a Hebraism. קֳדָם would be the Aramaic equivalent in Luke 9^{52}, Acts 13^{24}.

The same applies to *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, used by Luke, Acts 3^{19} 5^{41} 7^{45}. It is an obvious Hebraism modelled on מִלִּפְנֵי. But Paul also employs it 2 Thess. 1^9 with no Hebrew prototype, and Theodotion has *ἀπὸ προσώπου* in Dan. 7^8, and the kindred *ἐκ προσώπου* in Dan. 2^{15} 6^{27}, as rendering for מִן קֳדָם, which would be the term to fill the place of Luke's *ἀπὸ προσώπου*.

ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς occurs in an utterance of

[1] Perhaps with exception of Luke 19^{11} where *παραχρῆμα* used by the narrator himself must mean "suddenly, unexpectedly."

our Lord, reported by Luke (21[35]) for "upon the whole earth"; cf. Acts 17[26] *ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς*. This corresponds to the Hebrew עַל פְּנֵי; cf. Jer. 25[26] עַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה, LXX *ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς*. The Targums usually render the phrase literally by עַל אַפֵּי. But it may be questioned whether this was idiomatic Aramaic; עַל אַפֵּי מַיָּא does occur Vay. R. 24, but this is intended to mean "upon the surface of the water." A mere "upon" would scarcely have been expressed in this way. Luke has therefore in this instance made use of a Hebraism.

On the other hand, it is no mere Hebraism when Luke (20[21]) employs *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπόν τινος*, for which Mark (12[14]) and Matthew (22[16]) put *βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπόν τινος*. The Hebrew equivalent is נָשָׂא פְּנֵי פ׳, *e.g.* Lev. 19[15]. Onkelos has נְסַב אַפֵּי, and this occurs also j. Sanh. 29[a] נְסַב לֵהּ אַפִּין. Thus the expression is also Aramaic. Its complete absorption into the Hellenistic idiom appears from the formation of the substantives *προσωπολημψία*, Rom. 2[11], *προσωπολήμπτης*, Acts 10[34]. A substantially different meaning belongs to סְבַר אַפִּין, אַסְבַּר אַפִּין, which Levy in both his dictionaries puts alongside of *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*. The former is not the term for "to be partial to," but means "to regard favourably, to give heed to," see Targ. Jerus. I. Gen. 32[20]; b. Taan. 23[a]; and for the expression סְבַר אַפִּין, "a glance," Vay. R. 5.

στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον with Infinitive is used by Luke (9[51]) for "to set one's face towards." This is the LXX expression for the Hebrew שִׂים פָּנִים, *e.g.* Jer. 21[10]. Onkelos has rendered this phrase literally by שַׁוִּי אַפִּין in Gen. 31[21], in which passage the LXX has varied the rendering; but this literal rendering is avoided by the Targum in Jer. 21[10], Ezek. 6[2]. On the other hand, the synonymous נָתַן פָּנִים is literally translated in the LXX by *διδόναι τὸ πρόσωπον*, 2 Chron. 20[3], Dan. 10[15]. In view of יְהַב עֵינֵיהּ בְּ, "he turned his eyes upon," b. Sabb. 34[a], יְהַב אַפִּין בְּ cannot, of course, be quite impossible. But in the metaphorical sense repre-

sented in Luke 9[51] such an expression cannot be authenticated. Luke makes an inexact application of a Hebraism known to him through the Greek Old Testament.

Very exceptional is Luke 9[53] *τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.* The sense is, "he was minded to repair to Jerusalem." Resch compares Ex. 33[15] and 2 Sam. 17[11], in which latter passage the LXX has the same phrase. But in that case the meaning of פָּנֶיךָ הֹלְכִים is, "(if) thou thyself goest (not)," a sense quite inapplicable in Luke. In 2 Sam. 17[11] the Targum has rendered פָּנֶיךָ by אַתְּ, "thou," and therefore had no exact equivalent at hand. Hence this phrase of Luke is, like the preceding, a Hebraism incorrectly used, and incapable of imitation in Hebrew. Luke 9[53] refers back to ver. 51. The phrase there used, *τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ*, ought properly to have been repeated. The expression in ver. 53 is a faulty abridgment of the complete locution. It agrees with the habit of Luke, pointed out by Vogel,[1] to use some expression that slips from his pen a second time after a short interval, and then perhaps never again.

11. *ἐνώπιον.*[2]

ἐνώπιον, used by the Hellenists in imitation of such Hebrew expressions as לִפְנֵי, לְעֵינֵי, is absent from Matthew and Mark, occurs once in John, and in Luke's Gospel about twenty times. Its use in Luke, and likewise in Paul and in the Apocalypse, merely proves the predominant influence of the Greek dialect represented by the LXX, but is no testimony in favour of a Semitic primary gospel, still less in favour of a Hebrew or an Aramaic form of the latter. The inferences based on this point by Blass[3] are hasty. According to Deissmann, indeed, Neue Bibelstudien, 40 f. (= Bible Studies

[1] *Th. Vogel*, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil (1897), 27 f.

[2] *J. Vorstius*, op. cit. ii. 214; *D. Schilling*, op. cit. 129.

[3] *F. Blass*, Evangelium secundum Lukam, xxii.

[T. & T. Clark], p. 213), the word belongs to "profane" or non-ecclesiastical Greek.

12. καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐγένετο δέ.[1]

The expression καὶ ἐγένετο or ἐγένετο δέ is used to introduce an added definiteness to an action about to be reported. It is found six times in Matthew,—five of these being in the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν (συνετέλεσεν),—four times in Mark, forty-two times in Luke, *but is entirely absent from John.* The formula corresponds to the Hebrew וַיְהִי,[2] and occurs also in 1 Macc., Bel and the Dragon (LXX and Theod.), Judith (not in Tobit), Apocalypse of Baruch, 2 Esdras, and rarely in the Books of Enoch and Jubilees; but it has decidedly *no Aramaic equivalent.*[3] Even in biblical Aramaic it is already unfamiliar, and in the post-biblical Jewish Aramaic it has entirely disappeared. The rendering of ויהי by וַהֲוָה, which the Targums adopt, is clearly not endorsed by the spoken Aramaic. The Aramaic Scroll of the Hasmonæans in its present form begins, indeed, with the words וַהֲוָה בְּיוֹמֵי אַנְטִיוּכַס, "and it came to pass in the days of Antiochus." But when it proceeds with מַלְכָּא רַב וְתַקִּיף הֲוָה, this cannot be translated "there was a great and mighty king," because Antiochus himself is the king in question. On the contrary, the words וַהֲוָה בְּיוֹמֵי, probably an imitation of Esth. 1[1], and not attested, moreover, by all the authorities for the text, must be deleted, so that this instance has also to be eliminated. Any one desiring to collect instances in favour of a Hebrew primitive gospel would have to name in the first rank this καὶ ἐγένετο. Moreover, it must be observed that it is plainly Luke who makes so frequent use of the phrase, and that, too, through-

[1] *J. Vorstius*, op. cit. ii. 168–172; *D. Schilling*, op. cit. 163 f.; *Th. Vogel*, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas, 46.

[2] See *F. E. König*, Syntax der hebr. Sprache, §§ 341*s*, 370.

[3] καὶ ἐγένετο is found, indeed, Dan. 3[7] in Theod., but not in the Aramaic; similarly 3[91] LXX in the transition from the interpolated Song of the Three Children to the Canonical Text.

out both his writings, not, as might be expected, exclusively or chiefly in his initial chapters, for which many postulate a Semitic original. Even the "We-sections," for which, hitherto at least, critics have not assumed a Semitic original, are not without it; see Acts $21^{1.5}$ 27^{44} $28^{3.17}$. It is further to be remarked that the discourses of Jesus, which might well have afforded occasion for the use of the phrase, hardly ever contain it. As these are reported in Matthew it is not found at all,—in Mark it occurs only in 4^4, where, however, the parallel passages Matt. 13^4, Luke 8^5 omit it; in Luke only in 16^{22} and 19^{15}, while Paul in an address uses it twice, Acts $22^{6.17}$. Facts like these forbid the assumption of a Hebrew original as the necessary source of the phrase.

13. *ἐν τῷ with the Infinitive.*[1]

The infinitive preceded by *ἐν τῷ* and followed by the subject of the clause is used by Matthew only once (13^4), and likewise only once by Mark (4^4) in the parallel passage. Luke, on the other hand, has it twenty-five times, sometimes with *καὶ ἐγένετο*, sometimes independently, and not confined to any one section of the Gospel; John never has it. Examples: *ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν*, Matt. 13^4 (Luke 8^5, Mark 4^4); *ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, Luke 8^{40}; *ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνήν*, Luke 9^{36}. This construction, which Blass records as an Aramaism,[2] has been formed by the LXX, after the model of the Hebrew בְּ with the infinitive; see, *e.g.*, Gen. 38^{28} בְּלָדְתָּהּ; LXX *ἐν τῷ τίκτειν αὐτήν*. The Targums similarly copy it (Gen. 38^{28} Onk. בְּמֵילָדָהּ), but in the spoken Aramaic it is wanting. Once, however, the biblical dialect (Dan. 6^{21}) has the kindred construction of the infinitive with בְּ. The particle כַּד (כְּדִי) with finite verb or participle is the substitute employed on the whole most

[1] *J. Vorstius*, op. cit. ii. 163–166; *D. Schilling*, op. cit. 162; *F. Blass*, Gramm. d. neutestamentl. Griechisch, 232.

[2] Evang. sec. Lucam, xxii.

LIBRARY OF THE

frequently; see Dan. $6^{11.15}$, and Gramm. d. j.-pal. Aram. 185. Onkelos puts this particle when the Hebrew text has the infinitive with בְּ; see Gen. 29^{13} בְּשָׁמְעַ לָבָן; Onk. כַּד שְׁמַע לָבָן.

The construction *ἐν τῷ* occurs in the discourses of Jesus as given in Matthew, Mark, and Luke only in the instance *ἐν τῷ σπείρειν*, which is common to all three, and elsewhere only in Luke 10^{35} 19^{15}. There is thus no ground for maintaining that it originally belonged to the language of Jesus Himself. Besides, where it does occur, it may easily be traced to the Aramaic construction with בְּ. Here, too, as a narrator, Luke shows himself partial to Hebraising formulæ.

14. *The emphasising of the Verb by means of its cognate Substantive.*[1]

It is a mere repetition of the text of the LXX which is written in the citations, Matt. 13^{14} (cf. Mark 4^{12}) *ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, βλέποντες βλέπετε*; Matt. 15^{4} (Mark 7^{10}) *θανάτῳ τελευτάτω*; Acts 7^{34} *ἰδὼν εἶδον*. The only instance that occurs independently of the Old Testament text in the discourse of Jesus is *ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα*, Luke 22^{15}; cf. Acts 4^{17} E, *ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα*; 5^{28} *παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν*; 23^{14} *ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν*; John 3^{29} *χαρᾷ χαίρει*. An allied usage is *ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν*, Mark 4^{41}, Luke 2^{9}; *ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην*, Matt. 2^{10}.

The Hebrew mode of emphasising the finite verb by adding its infinitive or cognate substantive, though still frequent in 1 Maccabees (see above), is in the Palestinian Aramaic of the Jews—apart from the Targums—quite unknown. The solitary example of its use is the *terminus technicus* of the Rabbinic schools in the Palestinian Talmud, מְסַבּוֹר סְבַר, "he gave it as his opinion," j. Erub. 18^{c}; j. Yom. 42^{c}; j. Keth. 28^{b}. Apart from this, it is never used.[2]

[1] *Joh. Vorstius*, op. cit. ii. 177–193; *D. Schilling*, op. cit. 165 ff.

[2] See my Gramm. d. j.-pal. Aram. 226.

Hence we must not assume that Jesus was in the habit of using it. In Luke 22[15] the allusion to the LXX rendering of נִכְסֹף נִכְסַפְתָּה, "thou hast greatly longed for," Gen. 31[30], will have originated with the narrator. As the Synoptists do not use it anywhere else, while John has it only once, it is clear that an original in classical Hebrew need not be postulated as its source. Nor is it at all necessary to assume any such antecedent in the case of *φοβεῖν φόβον μέγαν* and *χαίρειν χαρὰν μεγάλην*, since reference to the LXX expressions for יָרֵא יִרְאָה גְדוֹלָה, Jonah 1[10], and שָׂמַח שִׂמְחָה גְדוֹלָה, Jonah 4[6], fully suffices for elucidation.

15. *εἶναι with the Participle.*

It is an established principle in regard to the Hebrew of the Old Testament that the union of הָיָה with the participle is quite permissible, even where there is no question of the continuance of an action.[1] In post-biblical Hebrew this became a very common construction when the reference is to the past.[2] This result was brought about by the influence of the Aramaic, as may be seen from the usage prevalent so early as the biblical dialect of Aramaic.[3] One example[4] from j. Ber. 2[d] will demonstrate how extensively the Galilean dialect can make use of this form: רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחְמָנִי כַּד הֲוָה נָחִית לְעִבּוּרָא הֲוָה מִתְקַבֵּל בֵּי יַעֲקוֹב גָּרוֹסָא וַהֲוָה רַבִּי זְעֵירָא מִטַּמַּר בֵּינֵי קִפֵּיָא מִשְׁמְעִנֵּיהּ הֵיךְ הֲוָה קָרֵי שְׁמַע וַהֲוָה קָרֵי וְחָזַר קָרֵי עַד דַּהֲוָה שָׁקַע נוֹ שְׁנָתֵיהּ—"When Rabbi Samuel bar Nachmani went down to settle the leap year, he found hospitality with Jacob the grain merchant; and Rabbi Ze'ēra hid himself among the hampers that he might hear how he read the Shema, and (he observed that) he kept repeating it over till he fell asleep."

[1] *König*, Syntax der hebr. Sprache, § 239*b*, *c*.

[2] *A. Geiger*, Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache Mischnah, i. 39 f.; *J. H. Weiss*, Mischpaṭ lĕschōn ha-Mischnā, 88.

[3] *E. Kautzsch*, Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram. 141; *K. Marti*, Kurzgef. Gramm. der bibl.-aram. Sprache, 104 f.

[4] Text according to Lehmann's edition.

The Synoptists make use of this idiom exclusively in the narrative coupled with ἦν and ἦσαν, but do not report it among the words of Jesus, which contain only once ἔσονται with the participle, Luke 17[35]. The Gospel of John has ἦν with the participle only once (3[23]). There is consequently no ground for attaching, as Blass[1] does, special significance to the fact that in the Acts (22[19. 20]) the construction occurs twice in a discourse of Paul which was delivered in *Aramaic*, while in the second half of the Acts the construction is notably rarer than in the first half. But it must be remarked, as a very striking circumstance, that the construction is absent from the discourses of Jesus, although the parables might well have furnished occasion for the use of it.

The frequent use of the present tense in narrative in the Gospel of Mark is regarded by W. C. Allen, "The Original Language of the Gospel acc. to St. Mark" (Expos., 6th ser., vi. 436 ff.), as an Aramaism, on the ground that it goes back to the Aramaic use of the participle instead of the finite verb. But the secular Greek also allows the use of a present in historical narrative, and that not only in more extended passages for the sake of vivid presentation, but also in detached instances throughout the context of the narrative. Mark's fondness for the present tense is an individual trait, like his constant use of εὐθέως.

It appears, then, from the foregoing that we must class as distinct Aramaisms the redundant ἀφείς (καταλιπών) and ἤρξατο, as well as the adverb εὐθύς (παραχρῆμα). The use of εἶναι with the participle to represent a historic tense is Aramaic rather than Hebrew. The redundant use of ἐλθών, καθίσας, ἑστώς, ἀναστάς (ἐγερθείς) belongs equally to Aramaic and Hebrew. The genuine Hebraisms are the phrases connected with πρόσωπον, the construction ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, the emphasising of the verb by its cognate sub-

[1] *Blass*, Evang. sec. Lucam, xxi.

stantive, and the formulæ *καὶ ἐγένετο*, *ἐλάλησεν λέγων*, *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*.

As regards the distribution of these, the distinct Aramaisms, except *ἀφείς*, which Luke avoids, are represented in all three Synoptists. Further, the idioms with *ἐλθών*, *καθίσας*, *ἑστώς*, *ἀναστάς* (*ἐγερθείς*), and *εἶναι* with the participle are common to them all without exception, and these idioms are *possible* Aramaisms. The genuine Hebraisms are almost exclusively peculiarities of Luke's Gospel. *καὶ ἐγένετο* also is used predominantly by Luke; it is only *ἀποκριθείς*, which is of uncertain origin, that is to be found in all the Synoptists, and is even employed by John, who almost entirely avoids the other Hebraisms and Aramaisms. The Acts of the Apostles agrees in linguistic peculiarities with the Gospel of Luke.

The idioms discussed above are marks principally of the narrative style of the evangelists, and in the discourses of Jesus are to be looked for only in so far as these contain narrative, as in the parables. They show at once the incorrectness of Schmiedel's contention,[1] that the narrative style of the Gospels and the Acts is the best witness of the Greek that was spoken among the Jews. The fact is that the narrative sections of the Synoptists have more Hebrew features than the discourses of Jesus communicated by them.

In the discourses of Jesus, then, it is the distinct Aramaisms, except *ἀφείς*—accidentally absent perhaps—that are found, and also the possible Aramaisms *ἐλθών*, *καθίσας*, *ἑστώς*, *ἀναστάς*. Only in Luke—and even there in isolated instances—are to be found *εἶναι* with the participle, the specifically Hebrew *ἐπὶ προσώπου*, and the emphasising of the verb by its cognate substantive; and similarly, almost confined to Luke, *ἐν τῷ* with the infinitive. Luke, too, is the reporter of the Hebraism *καὶ ἐγένετο*, which, apart from Mark 4^{4}, occurs in the words of Jesus only in Luke 16^{22} 19^{15}

[1] Winer's Grammatik der neutestamentlichen Sprachidiome, § 4. 1^{b}.

εἶπεν—*λέγων* stands only in Mark 12[26], in a saying of our Lord.

As for *ἀποκριθείς*, which should perhaps be regarded as a Hebraism, it is found in the parables of the Two Sons, Matt. 21[28ff.]; the Ten Virgins, Matt. 25[1ff.]; the Intrusted Talents, Matt. 25[14ff.]; (but not in Luke 19[11ff.]); the description of the Last Judgment, Matt. 25[31ff.]; in the parable of the Importunate Friend, Luke 11[5ff.]; in the answer after the door has been shut, Luke 13[25]; and in the parable of the Prodigal Son, Luke 15[11ff.] It is wanting, however, where it might have been expected, in the parables of the Tares in the Field, Matt. 13[24ff.]; the Unjust Steward, Luke 16[1ff.]; the Rich Man, Luke 16[19ff.]; and the Vineyard, Luke 20[9ff.]

Again in this connection it is seen that the Hebraisms proper are special characteristics of Luke. There is reason, therefore, for a closer scrutiny of the style of this evangelist with its wealth of Hebraisms. In the examples already adduced, the fact of their occurrence is not more remarkable than the fact that each individual Hebraism occurs so seldom. If Luke had worked in dependence upon a Hebrew original, then such idioms must have occurred much more frequently than they do, for he does not shrink from using those Hebraisms which are most foreign to the feeling of the Greek language. Can the few cases of the Hebraistic use of *πρόσωπον* have slipped from his pen by mere inadvertence, while in general he studiously avoided this Hebraism? Other data of a like import may be mentioned. Only once (9[28]) does he use the quite un-Aramaic phrase *μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους*, Hebr. אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה; once, too, (1[70]) *διὰ στόματος*, Hebr. בְּפִי[1]—also peculiarly Hebrew. In addition there fall from his pen such pseudo-Hebraisms as *τὸ πρόσωπον*, 9[53], mentioned above; *ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ*

[1] Luke's peculiarity in using certain phrases only once or twice is pointed out also by *Vogel*, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas, 27; and by *Blass*, Philology of the Gospels (1898), 113 f., 118.

ἐξ ὕψους, 1[78],[1] formed entirely after the Greek Bible and quite impossible to reproduce in Hebrew; and the phrase, equally elusive of the translator's art, ἐν τῷ συνπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς, Acts 2[1]. The frequency of the Hebraisms used by Luke, especially in the first chapters of the Gospel, has led de Lagarde[2] to the very just conclusion that these chapters have throughout a colouring distinctly Hebrew, not Aramaic and not Greek. At the same time, this writer has made no further statement as to the origin of these Hebraisms. Resch is of opinion that they have arisen because the chapters were translated from a Hebrew original, although he himself perceives that the "Hebraisms and Old Testament Parallels" to Matt. 1. 2, Luke 1. 2, collected by him in "Kindheits-evangelium," 30–56 (half of which by the way should be deleted), demonstrate primarily only the close relation that subsists between those chapters and the Greek Old Testament.[3] While Resch holds Luke himself to be the translator, Blass[4] is convinced that Luke was quite ignorant of Hebrew; he supposes that Luke had before him the alleged Hebrew source (which had originated with one of the priests) in a Greek translation done in the style of the LXX, and, further, that in those chapters he had given his own personal style greater scope as he proceeded. Vogel[5] also adopts a "special source" for the beginning of Luke's Gospel, but affirms that his investigation had not disclosed any sharp distinction in point of style between the beginning and the rest of the book. Hence the assumption of a Hebrew document as the source for Luke 1. 2 must at any rate be held as still unproved; and it might even be maintained that the strongly marked Hebrew style of those chapters is on the whole due not to the use of

[1] See Fundamental Ideas, VIII. 10. [2] Mitteilungen, iii. 345.

[3] The variations in the text of the Greek should remove the intrinsic proof for the Hebrew original.

[4] Evangelium sec. Lucam, xxiii; cf. Philology of the Gospels, 195.

[5] Zur Charakteristik des Lukas, 32f.

any primary source, but to Luke himself. For here, as in the beginning of the Acts, in keeping with the marvellous contents of the narrative, Luke has written with greater consistency than usual in biblical style, intending so to do and further powerfully affected by the "liturgic frame of mind" of which Deissmann[1] speaks. The correctness of our view as to the Hebraisms of Luke is corroborated by the Græcisms which also flow from his pen. As a Græcism, *e.g.*, must be characterised the form of address *ἄνθρωπε*, Luke 5^{20} 12^{14} $22^{58.\,60}$. Delitzsch, Salkinson, and Resch avail themselves here of בֶּן־אָדָם, though such an address is rare and in the passages concerned quite unsuitable. The same holds good of the form of address *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* which Luke likes to use in the Acts (2^{29} 7^{2} 13^{15} $15^{7.\,13}$ 22^{1} $23^{1.\,6}$ 28^{17}). Any one familiar with Jewish literature knows that אֲנָשִׁים אַחִים may, indeed, stand for "people, who are brothers," Gen. 13^{8}, but cannot be used as a form of address. A Jew speaking to Jews regularly addresses them as אַחֵינוּ, "our brethren," j. Yom. 43^{d}; j. Taan. 65^{ab}; j. Kidd. 64^{c}; Taan. ii. 1, אַחֵינוּ; while David, 1 Chron. 28^{2}, says to the people אַחַי וְעַמִּי, "my brethren and my people"; and this is made a precedent for every Israelitish king, Tos. Sanh. iv. 4.

And, finally, let the following points be noticed. The betrayer, according to Blass, was called *Σκαριώθ* by Luke (6^{16} 22^{3}), agreeing with Cod. D 6^{16}; Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott-Hort prefer *Ἰσκαριώθ*, 6^{16}; *Ἰσκαριώτην*, 22^{3}. In any case, Luke was ignorant of the form אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת (see under No. V.). The result of the investigations into the Hosanna cry detailed later[2] tends to show that Luke failed to understand this also. It is again probably a misinterpretation when he assigns to *Βαρνάβας*, Acts 4^{36}, the meaning *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*, — with the explanation of which I too have wrestled,[3] — while we seem to have to do with the

[1] Bibelstudien, 71 [Eng. tr., p. 76].
[2] Fundamental Ideas, VIII. 9.
[3] Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 142.

Palmyrenian name ברנבו, "son of Nebo" (cf. the Palmyrenian names נבובל, נבוזבד, נבוקוא), as Deissmann[1] has correctly recognised. In regard to Luke's tradition of the voice at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, and for his use of *παῖς*, Acts 3[4], see Fundamental Ideas, IX. 3. If these observations be correct, it follows that an immediate use by Luke of Semitic sources must be pronounced highly improbable. If he were born a Greek, as must be admitted on other grounds,[2] such use, moreover, can hardly be imagined.

If, then, in the case of that Synoptist who is most guilty of Hebraisms, these are due, in most cases, at least, to the author himself,[3] and should properly be called "Septuagint-Græcisms," the probability is that the same should apply to the other Synoptists as well. Let it suffice merely to recall the phrase *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτι ἐτέλεσεν* (*συνετέλεσεν*), used five times by Matthew, who, apart from this, has *καὶ ἐγένετο* only once (9[10]), in agreement with Mark 2[15]. The way in which this expression is used shows beyond question that it originated with the author of our first Gospel. This applies likewise to the circumstantial formula, *ἵνα* (*ὅπως, τότε*) *πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ—λέγοντος*, peculiar to Matthew, and used ten times by him. It sounds very like Hebrew, and should be compared with the common formula in ancient Jewish exegesis: לְקַיֵּם מַה שֶּׁנֶּאֱמַר, "in order to establish what was said."[4] And yet its formation must be

[1] Bibelstudien (1895), 177 f.; Neue Bibelstudien (1897), 15 f. [Eng. tr., pp. 309 f., 187 f.].

[2] *Th. Vogel*, op. cit. 18.

[3] Of course it is Luke in his character as Christian annalist that is here meant. His manner of speaking and writing on general topics appears in the preface to the Gospel—a passage which should not be regarded as evidence of exceptional literary elaboration.

[4] *S. Bacher*, Die älteste Terminologie der Jüdischen Schriftauslegung (1899), 170. Similar also is the formula introductory to Targum exposition: אֲמִיר דְּאִתְּמַר עַל יְדֵי—נְבִיאָה, Röm. Machzor (Bologna, 1540), Schebuoth, and the formula in the Kiddush after Seder Rab Amram, i. 10[b]: כַּדָּבָר הָאָמוּר בְּשִׁירֵי עֻזְּךָ מִפִּי דָוִד מְשִׁיחַ צִדְקְךָ, "according to the word which is spoken in the songs of Thy might by the mouth of David Thy righteous anointed."

ascribed to the Greek-writing author, a position which even Resch, Kindheits-evangelium, 19 ff., does not venture to gainsay. Thus these Hebraisms of Matthew are also in reality due to the influence of the Greek Bible (Greek Biblicisms). And what is to be thought of the *Ἰσκαριώτης* or *Ἰσκαριώθ* in Matthew and Mark? And of the *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*, Mark 3^{17}, which may indeed be connected in a way with the strange term *Βοανηργές*,[1] but is in no sense an accurate translation of it? It seems quite a Hebrew trait when in Matt. 26^{17} (Mark 14^{12}) the day on which the Passover lamb was slain is called "the first day of unleavened bread" (Luke 22^{7} even has "the day of unleavened bread"); and yet no "Hebraist" would have specified that day in this manner, quite apart from the fact that the designation "Feast of unleavened bread" was uniformly replaced among the Jews in later times, at least, by the name "Passover."

It will suffice here to have shown meanwhile that the Hebraisms of the Synoptists, though undeniably present,[2] do not constitute the proof of a Hebrew original; that, on the contrary, the thesis is justified that the fewer the Hebraisms, the greater the originality;[3] the more numerous the Hebraisms in any passage, the greater the interference of Hellenistic redactors. It must be noted that the Jewish Aramaic current among the people was considerably freer from Hebrew influence than the Greek which the Synoptists *write*, and also that in the rabbinical sphere the special religious terminology—even in the case of recurring Hebrew formulæ—exhibits a striking independence of the Old Testament.[4]

[1] See Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 112, and p. 49 in this volume.

[2] *Franz Delitzsch's* verdict, "The Shemitic woof of the N.T. Hellenism is Hebrew, not Aramaic" (The Hebrew New Testament, 31), is not without foundation, but still is not the correct conclusion.

[3] Cf. above, p. 19 f.

[4] Our Lord's manner of speech, therefore, is not a final test of His literary knowledge. *A. Meyer*, Jesu Muttersprache, 56, discusses this point with too much hesitancy. If Jerome expressly testifies that all the Jews of his time knew the Hebrew Old Testament, could Jesus have been less familiar with it?

V. Alleged Proofs of a Primitive Hebrew Gospel (Urevangelium).

As the most effectual means of ascertaining the limits, content, and language of alleged Semitic sources of the Gospel, Resch,[1] especially, has recently indicated and sought to apply the method of tracing back to one Semitic term the several variants of a word in the Gospel text, as these may occur throughout the entire tradition within and without the Gospels. Wherever in the Synoptists he found such a retracing of the variants to a Semitic expression practicable throughout, he was led consistently enough to adopt a Semitic primary source containing the entire synoptic material, and even something in addition to it. This source, in his opinion, was written in Hebrew, and may be divided into the two documents יֵשׁוּעַ תּוֹלְדוֹת, "The Gospel of the Childhood," and דִּבְרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ, "The Sayings of our Lord." Recently this all-embracing source of the Gospels has been published by him tentatively in Hebrew and Greek under the title "Die Logia Jesu" (1898).[2] The three Synoptists, according to this theory, have merely made a different selection and arrangement of the same Hebrew material to which all alike had access. They cannot rank as independent authors. This conclusion has nowhere met with approval, and rightly. Even the method by which it was reached was wrong.[3]

The fact that Greek synonyms *may* often be traced back

See *S. Krauss*, The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers, Jew. Quart. Rev. vi. (1894) 231 f. If a Hellenistic-Jewish mother and grandmother initiated Timothy from his childhood into the knowledge of the Holy Scripture (2 Tim. 3^{15}, cf. 1^{5}), despite the fact that his father was a heathen, it follows that at least as much should be expected in a "Hebraist" family in Palestine.

[1] *A. Resch*, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien, i.–v., Leipzig, 1893–97.

[2] Besides the large edition, with notes in support of its readings, a smaller has also appeared, containing the Hebrew narrative without comment.

[3] It seems almost superfluous to repeat the condemnation of this method, as it has already been often enough insisted on by Resch's reviewers with gratifying unanimity; see especially *Ad. Jülicher*, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1896, i. 1–9.

to one Hebrew word, though sometimes several Hebrew synonyms also may be discovered, in no way proves that a Hebrew word really lies behind the Greek synonyms. One might almost as well name an Aramaic or an Arabic word, and then in the same way proceed to argue an Aramaic or Arabic original. The numerous proofs offered by Resch in favour of a Hebrew original—in so far as they are purely of this character — are therefore quite devoid of cogency. Only in the case of striking deviations among the variants could a testimony in favour of a Semitic original be inferred with *some* degree of certitude, provided there was found a Semitic term which perchance so solved the problem of the divergent readings, that the one appears, with good reason, to be a misunderstanding easily possible, the other the correct interpretation of the Semitic expression. Even then, however, it would remain questionable whether the divergent readings had not arisen through other causes, so that it is only by accident that a Semitic term appears to account for the deviation. This must indeed be always the most plausible supposition, when one reflects that the direct use of Semitic written sources, even by the authors of our Gospels, is doubtful, and at any rate not yet proved; further, that at a later date such writings could have been read by only a very few in the Church —even a Palestinian like Justin understood no Hebrew; that in regard to a later circulation of Greek versions of a Semitic primitive gospel equal uncertainty prevails, for the statement of Papias in regard to Matthew's translation of the Logia must not be referred to written works of this class; and that, finally, it is much more likely that extra-canonical gospels, gospel harmonies, translations, and popular expositions in common use influenced the form which the text assumed in the course of its transmission, than that such an influence was exerted by the after-effects of the alleged Semitic original document. A fundamental error

in Resch, and also in other biblical critics of our time, appears to me to be a marked depreciation of the capacity of the authors of the historical books of the Bible, who are treated too much as mere redactors and mechanical copyists or translators of source documents, and a not less exaggerated estimate of the precision of subsequent copyists, translators, and quotations of such books, which has gone so far that sometimes the most extravagant excess of an unscrupulous transcriber is, just because of its extravagance, pronounced to be the original reading, or the later correction of the author himself.

It is not possible to discuss here all that is advanced by Resch in favour of a Hebrew primitive gospel, and yet the inadequacy of his proofs must be demonstrated at this point, so as to place it beyond doubt that we are well entitled in our investigations to leave the Hebrew out of consideration, even despite the fact that a written source in Hebrew might possibly have been the intermediary between the words of Jesus spoken in Aramaic and the Gospels written in Greek. I therefore adduce chiefly such instances as those of which Resch, in opposition to Arnold Meyer,[1] has asserted that "they supply evidence distinctly against Aramaic, and as distinctly in favour of Hebrew as the original language of the דִּבְרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ." It will then appear that the evidence of these passages, to say the least, is invariably susceptible of, and not infrequently demands, a very different interpretation.

In Luke 9^{25} Resch commends Salkinson's rendering of *τί ὠφελεῖται* by מַה בֶּצַע, on the ground that the variants *τί κέρδος*, *τί ὄφελος* are thereby accounted for. Now, this phrase מַה בֶּצַע, borrowed by Salkinson from Gen. 37^{26}, is, in view of Ps. 30^{10}, admissible in this passage. But the variants given above admit of explanation without the help of a Semitic original.

[1] Aussercanon. Paralleltexte, iv. 224.

In Luke 10^{7} Resch finds it noteworthy that the labourer, according to Luke, is worthy of "his hire" (*τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ*); according to Matthew, however, of "his maintenance" (*τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ*). The former, he holds, originates from Hebrew מְחִיר, the latter from מְחִיָּה, which was read by mistake for מְחִיר. But מְחִיר cannot possibly be the basis. The day labourer's "hire" is called in Hebrew invariably שָׂכָר, Aramaic אֶגַר; "maintenance" would indeed be, in biblical Hebrew, מְחִיָּה, while the later Hebrew, like the Aramaic, would use פַּרְנָסָה. And thus any retracing of the two expressions to one term as their source is impossible. Besides, there is no occasion for such an attempt. The proverb made use of by Jesus spoke naturally enough of the "hire," because that properly pertains to the day labourer. In Matthew "maintenance" is substituted for "hire," because in the context it could not be a question of "hire" which the disciples of Jesus would think of claiming, but merely of their "maintenance."

In regard to Luke 10^{37} R. makes the remark that *ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ*, in view of 2 Sam. 2^{6}, is an "emphatic and pure Hebraism." His point is the use of *μετά* in this phrase. But עִם would in this connection be possible also in Aramaic. According to b. Tam. 32^{a}, King Alexander gives the advice that he who desires to be loved among men "should show kindness to men" (יֵעָבֵד טִיבוּ עִם בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא). Similarly, the Targum has unhesitatingly rendered 2 Sam. 2^{6} by יֵעָבֵד יְיָ עִמְּכוֹן טִיבוּ. The fact is that Luke may quite well have simply adapted the LXX expression in 2 Sam. 2^{6}.

In Luke 11^{3} R. calls attention to the fact that a "standard Semitic, more precisely Aramaic, original" of the Lord's Prayer was not transmitted, and maintains that לְחֵם חֻקֵּנוּ is presumably the prototype of *ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐπιούσιος*. If R. has discovered the true sense of *ἐπιούσιος* here, it may still be asked why Aramaic equivalents, such as לְחֵם כִּפְתָנָא or לְחֵם חִסְרַנָּא, should not equally suffice. R. should rather have

affirmed still more distinctly that both Luke and Matthew in this case clearly rely upon a *Greek* source.

In Luke 12^{19} the rich man speaks "to his soul." In this R. detects a Hebraism. But this is also an Aramaic idiom, see Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 84 f.; and it might for that matter derive its origin equally well from the Greek Bible.[1] The same holds of *τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν*, Luke 21^{19}.

In Luke 13^{26} R. would alter the "teaching in the streets" to a "showing of the streets," because he regards the former as a misinterpretation of the original וּבִרְחֹבֹתֵינוּ הוֹרִיתָ. But these Hebrew words would have been correctly rendered by the meaning expressed in Luke 13^{26}, namely, "In our streets hast Thou taught." "Our streets or lanes hast Thou shown us" would have had to be quite differently expressed, and is, moreover, a strange way of expressing what R. takes to be the true meaning, "Thou Thyself hast charged us to come hither." The entire situation, besides, is misunderstood by R.

In Luke 13^{29} Ephrem's reading, which treats *θάλασσα* as one of the four points of the compass, is adequately accounted for by its concord with Ps. 107^{3} and Isa. 49^{12}. There is therefore no need to assume for it a special Hebrew source.[2] Besides, the text as altered by R., following Ephrem, would be no improvement, for no one could say what יָם should signify in the passage, since the West is previously specified. But even supposing it to have been uttered by Jesus through suggestion of Ps. 107^{3}, in that case ים is equally no designation of the West, and the Aramaic יַם would have been quite suitable.

For *βιάζεται*, Luke 16^{16}, R. gives as antecedent נִפְרַץ, "to spread out"; and for *βιασταί*, Matt. 11^{12}, פִּרְצִים, "those that break through." In that case neither evangelist has properly understood the former expression. But setting aside this

[1] Cf. the passages cited by *C. A. Briggs*, The use of נפש in the Old Testament, Journ. Bibl. Lit. xvi. 22 f.

[2] Resch's proof rests on the consideration that only in Hebrew can יָם stand for one of the directions, the Aramaic for West being מַעֲרָב.

assumption, the passage can be fully explained with the help of the Aramaic; see "Fundamental Ideas," I. end.

In Luke 22[7] R. believes that the difference between the Synoptic and Johannine dating of the day of the Passion may be explained by tracing *τῇ πρώτῃ* (*ἡμέρᾳ*) *τῶν ἀζύμων* in Matthew and Mark back to the Hebrew קֹדֶם חַג הַמַּצּוֹת. This, according to R., should mean "before the Feast of unleavened bread," whereas it has been incorrectly understood of the first day of the feast. Hebrew would thus give an easier solution than Aramaic. But the mistake is conceivable only on the part of an "Aramaist" who at the word קדם thought of קַדְמַי, "first," and besides קֶדֶם might mean "before" in Aramaic as well. So that the solution through Aramaic would be more complete. Nevertheless (1) it is in itself hazardous, and (2) it leads to no result, because the possibility advanced by Resch of an anticipatory celebration of the Passover by Jesus and His disciples is just as incredible as the more extravagant hypotheses of Chwolson and Lichtenstein.[1]

On Luke 22[42] R. remarks that the Lucan conception *παρενέγκαι* and the *παρελθέτω* of Matthew point back to the Hebrew העבר (= תַּעֲבֵר or תַּעֲבֹר). Aramaic, he holds, would not admit this twofold interpretation, because כוסא (read כָּסָא), which would be the subject in the second case, is in that language masculine, not as in Hebrew feminine. But in the Mishna[2] also כוס is of the masculine gender, so that biblical Hebrew would be the only source of the ambiguity. The variants, however, need by no means be ascribed to a difference in translation. That the same thought may be expressed by different writers in different terms, is an observation so common that it must always be the most natural supposition in any temperate treatment of textual questions.

In another place[3] Resch lays some stress on the con-

[1] *J. Lichtenstein*, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Hebr.), Matt. 26[18].
[2] Pes. x. 2, 4, 7. [3] Aussercanon. Paralleltexte, iii. 819.

sideration that from the *names* of the disciples of Jesus it may be concluded that there were three languages in use in their circle. Now there is no doubt that much Greek was spoken in Palestine.[1] But in a period when names of the most varied origin were in use among the Jews, no conclusion can be drawn for any special case. In spite of the names of Philip and Andrew, it is highly improbable that there were any "Hellenists" among the Twelve. And even though all the names of the apostles had been Hebrew names, there would still be no ground for thinking of special "Hebraists" as contrasted with "Aramaists." For Jews in all ages have borne Hebrew names.

For *Βοανηργές*, Mark 3^{17}, I had pointed out[2] *Βανηρογές* as *possibly* the original reading, without, however, suggesting a Hebrew source, as forms like קֹדֶשׁ, אֹדֶן are possible in Jewish Aramaic. R. regards this reading as settled, and treats the term as Hebrew. The wholly inapt linguistic comments which he adds to the peculiar *oa* may here be passed over; it is enough to assert that all depends on a conjectural reading, which is equally capable of explanation through Aramaic. Further, Jesus could quite well have given a Hebrew surname to the sons of Zebedee, though He never spoke in the Hebrew language. Surnames such as הַקַּטָּן in Talmudic times, and מְאוֹר הַגּוֹלָה in the Middle Ages, prove nothing whatever as to the vernacular of those who made use of these appellations. From the Old Testament it is apparent that *Ζεβεδαῖος* had been for a long period an established name among the Jews. And yet it is presumably either of Aramaic or of North-Palestinian origin. In

[1] On this point see *Th. Zahn*, Einleitung in d. N. Test. i. (1897) 24–51; *S. Krauss*, Griech. u. latein. Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum, i. (1898) xiii–xxii.

[2] Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 112. I should prefer now to assume that either *o* or *a* is a gloss, which subsequently found its way into the text. *βονη* and *βανη* are equally possible. If Mark desired to signify the Galilean indistinctness of the *a*, then *o* would quite suffice; *oa* remains meaningless. If Mark really wrote *oa*, his unfamiliarity with Aramaic was the cause.

Palmyra the name occurred in the forms זבדא, זבדי, זבדבול, זבדנבו, זבדעתה, זבדלא; in Greek, *Ζάβδας*, *Ζαβδίβηλος*, *Ζαβδεάθης*; the Jews had זבד, זבוד, זבדי, זבדיאל, זבדיה, זבדיהו, in which the divine names יהו, יה, אל correspond to the Palmyrene בול, נבו, עתה. Resch's affirmation[1] of a Hebrew origin of the name must therefore be seriously restricted.

In regard to *Βαρθολομαῖος*, Resch makes the comment that בַּר was "usual," even in Hebrew. That is quite inaccurate. It occurs in the Old Testament only in Prov. 21[2] and Ps. 2[12], and in the latter instance it is doubtless a wrong reading. It is, on the other hand, significant that the New Testament names which have בַּר in composition are not accompanied by one single example with בֶּן.

Λεββαῖος, for which R. twice puts לֵבִּי (!), should, in his opinion, be connected with the Hebrew לֵב, "heart," since the bearer of this name was also called *Θαδδαῖος*, Mark 3[18]. The latter name R. would derive from the Aram. תַּד, "breast-nipple,"[2] which he thinks also denotes the male breast in Aramaic. The latter contention is incorrect, and proof of the currency of such names is wanting. In any case תַּדַּי is to be taken with תוודם (*Θευδᾶς*) and תודום, and is therefore of Greek extraction, while *Λεββαῖος* corresponds to the Nabatæan לבאי. Any other derivation would require to be substantiated. The same individual was probably called in Semitic לְבַּי, and in Greek *Θευδᾶς*, from which תַּדַּי had been formed. To establish a more intimate connection between the two names is unnecessary. The surname *Καναναῖος* also points, according to R., to a Hebrew origin. But his derivation from הַקַּנָּא is impossible, as קַנָּאן is the necessary counterpart, and that would be an Aramaic nominal form. If, however, the text be altered to *Καννναῖος*, as seems to me commendable, then the Aramaic קַנָּי, "Zealot," is reached at least as easily as the Hebrew קַנָּא.

[1] Loc. cit. 822.

[2] *Holtzmann* expresses a similar opinion in Commentary on the two names.

As for *Μαθθαῖος*, the case is similar to that of the synonymous *Ζεβεδαῖος*. It is the name מתתיה, מתתיהו, מתיה, which did not appear among the Jews till a late period, and may be compared with the Palmyrene מתבול (*Μαθθαβώλ*) and its abbreviation מתא (*Μαθθᾶς*).

The names יוֹחָנָן, יַעֲקֹב, יְהוּדָה (יוּדָה), שִׁמְעוֹן (Greek form Συμεών,[1] but not שִׁימוֹן — so Resch), לֵוִי give no information as to the language spoken by those who were so called, so that *Ἰσκαριώθ*, *Ἰσκαριώτης* alone remains for consideration. There is every probability that *Ἰσκαριώθ* without the article was the original reading, from which arose through misunderstanding *Ἰσκαριώτης* as well as *Σκαριώθ* and *Σκαριώτης*. With *Ἰσκαριώθ* agrees *ὁ ἀπὸ Καρυώτου* found in Cod. Sin. John 6^{71}; Cod. D John 12^{4} $13^{2.26}$ 14^{22}, inasmuch as the former points back to the Hebrew אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת and the latter to the equivalent Aramaic דִּקְרִיּוֹת or דִּמִּן קְרִיּוֹת. Both may be verified as Jewish usages. There is mentioned, j. Sabb. 14^{d}, a Christian יַעֲקֹב אִישׁ כְּפַר סַמָּא, b. Sot. 43^{b} a יְהוּדָה אִישׁ כְּפַר עַבּוֹ, Ab. iii. 7 an אֶלְעָזָר אִישׁ בַּרְתּוֹתָא, j. Bez. 61^{c} a תּוּדֹס אִישׁ רוֹמֵי, and further with Aramaic designation j. Ab. z. 42^{a} זַבֵּי דַּאֶלְכְּסַנְדְּרִיאָה, Ech. R. Peth. יְהוֹשֻׁעַ דְּסִכְנִין.[2] The introduction of the name of the place by means of דִּמִּן is less common, as אֲבְדִּימִי דִּמִּן חֵיפָה, Midr. Till. 31. 6; יוֹסֵי דִּמִּן קֶסָרִי, b. Sanh. 108^{a}, or by means of מִן, as מַתַּנְיָה מִן דבתרתה, j. Orl. 60^{d}; יְהוּדָה מִפּוּרָא, b. Tam. 27^{a};[3] נהנוי דמן אורשלם, Corp. Inscr. Sem. ii. 1, 320. But such being the usage, and אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת being a common enough form of surname, showing that one with this name was a "Kariothite," it thus becomes very sur-

[1] *G. A. Deissmann*, Bibelstudien, 184 [Eng. tr. p. 315], draws attention to the fact that this is the genuinely Greek name *Σίμων*. For Hellenists it was an easy step to substitute this name for *Συμεών*; in the form סִימוֹן it then found its way into the language of the "Hebraists" also.

[2] The construction with דְּ appears to have been the one commonly used in Palestine.

[3] These periphrases are used by preference when a place-name does not readily lend itself to the formation of the corresponding Gentilic designation. Otherwise we should expect titles like Hebr. סַמּוֹנִי, Aram. צִפּוֹרָאָה.

prising that it should have been left untranslated. One would have expected *ὁ ἀπὸ Καριώθ*, like *ὁ ἀπὸ Καρυώτου* in Cod. D,[1] and like John 21[2] *Ναθαναὴλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ*, just as Josephus, Bell. Jud. IV. vi. 2, speaks of a certain *Ἄνανος ὁ ἀφαμμαοῦς*, supposing they did not venture to write *ὁ Καριώθιος* or something similar. It is a very plausible conjecture that *Ἰσκαριώθ* was already unintelligible to the evangelist. Some late writer thought of a place *Ἰσκάρ* or *Ἰσκάρια*, and therefore formed *Ἰσκαριώτης*, while the originator of the text of the Synoptists in Cod. D preferred *Σκαριώθ* and *Σκαριώτης*, because he followed a Syrian exemplar.[2]

Mistakes of this kind are inconceivable on the part of one who had before him אִישׁ קְרִיוֹת in a Hebrew source and wished to translate it. They explain themselves, however, if we suppose that יְהוּדָה אִישׁ קְרִיוֹת was encountered by a Hellenist in a Greek or Aramaic environment. Even the latter is quite possible, because such surnames, whether they were Hebrew or Aramaic in form, usually remained unaltered without regard to the language being used at the time; cf. *e.g.* שִׁמְעֲלַי הַדָּרוֹמִי, j. Ab. z. 41[d] in an Aramaic narrative. As the Hebrew formation with אִישׁ occurs also in still later periods, it is clear that Hebrew was not necessarily the spoken language where such a surname originated.[3]

[1] *E. Nestle*, Philologica sacra, 14 f., Expository Times, ix. (1897–98), 140, 240, holds that Cod. D has preserved the original reading of the Johannine Gospel. The peculiar ending, however, is already in itself an obstacle, as it suggests the Greek *καρυωτός*. The suspicion that the Greek reading *Ἰσκαριώτης* lies at the basis, is not improbable. See, further, *F. H. Chase*, The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels (1895), 102 ff., Expository Times, ix. (1897–98), 189, 285 f., who affirms a Syriac origin for the reading.

[2] Syr. Sin. and Peshita have סכריוטא, Evangel. Hieros. זכריוטא, Syr. Cur. אסקריוטא and אסכריוטא.

[3] The case is probably different with the later designation of the Jewish Christians as *Ἐβιωναῖοι*. Undoubtedly the prevalent opinion is (see recently *G. Uhlhorn*, Prot. Real.-Enc.[3] under "Ebioniten") that the Christians were generally known as אֶבְיוֹנִים, "poor" among the Jews, or that they themselves adopted this designation in Palestine. But since the Jews, any more than the Jewish Christians, did not speak Hebrew, and since this name for the Jewish

Lastly must be mentioned the utterance of Jesus from the Cross, Mark 15^{34} (Matt. 27^{46}), to which Resch[1] attributes decisive finality in regard to the language in which the primary Gospel was written. He is convinced that the Hebrew form of the utterance represented in Cod. D by ἡλεὶ ἡλεὶ λαμᾶ ζαφθανεί, that is, אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָה עֲזַבְתָּנִי, was the original. Not till a later date, when Hebrew was no longer understood, did the Aramaic setting of our present texts come into being. Resch attaches importance to the fact that the Evangel. Hierosol. expressly explains אלי by אלהי. This last consideration means very little. The translator followed his Greek exemplar and could render ὁ Θεός μου only by אלהי. At all events every Jew who spoke Aramaic was quite familiar with the word אֵל, which for that very reason is taken over into the Onkelos Targum without change from the Hebrew text. If Jesus uttered the words of the Psalm in the Aramaic language, then it was precisely אֵלִי that was most naturally to be expected. Thus the mistake of the people in supposing Elijah summoned, decides nothing as regards the original Hebrew form of the whole utterance. It is also impossible to see for what section of Greek-speaking Christians the Hebrew form should have been replaced by the Aramaic with a view to easier comprehension. Such Christians, indeed, understood equally little of both languages, and therefore required the immediate addition of the Greek equivalent. As the Gospel of Mark in other cases is peculiar in giving the words of Jesus as originally pronounced, it may be inferred that the saying in question was also from the first a constituent part of this Gospel; and since the sayings of our Lord communicated by Him in other cases (5^{41} 7^{34}) are given in Aramaic, then anything different should not be looked for in this

Christians is unfamiliar among the Jews, it is difficult to accept the opinion as correct. The old derivation from a proper name Ἐβιών is still the best, though we do not know any proper name of this form.

[1] Aussercanon. Paralleltexte, ii. 356.

case. Whether, then, Jesus uttered the Aramaic אֱלָהִי or the Hebraistic אֵלִי, is in itself of minor consequence. The latter appears to me to have the greater probability in its favour, as being the less natural in the Aramaic context. Supposing that this were so, it is then conceivable that to secure greater uniformity of language, one copyist corrected *ἤλεί* into *ἐλωεί*,[1] so that the whole clause should be Aramaic, while another changed *λεμᾶ σεβαχθανεί* into *λαμᾶ [ἀ]ζαφθανεί*,[2] so as to have the whole in Hebrew. From a statement of Epiphanius, cited by Resch, it is evident that the apparent bilingual character of the saying had, in fact, been remarked upon.

On principles similar to those of Resch,[3] though with the aid of a very different linguistic equipment, *E. Nestle* has also collected evidence in favour of a Semitic source for our Gospels. He has, however, expressly declared[4] that he has not extended the theory of a Hebrew original to the whole extent of the Lucan writings, nor even decided as to whether the sources used by Luke were in Hebrew or in Aramaic. A few remarks may now be made on such of Nestle's observations as fall within the domain of Hebrew (excepting, however, meantime his explanation of the reading *οἱ λοιποί*, Luke 11[2] Cod. D).

In Luke 12[1] Blass has adopted into the text the reading

[1] *ἐλωεί*, for which Eusebius, Demonstr. Ev. x. 8, even puts Ἐλωείμ instead of *ἐλαεί*, I have explained, Gram. d. j.-pal. Ar. 123, as an echo of the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים. It is more probable, however, that the duller sound of the *ā* is represented, although this cannot be supported by instances in Palestine during the earlier period.

[2] עֻזְּבַתָּנִי, transliterated into Greek required *ἀζαφθανεί*, for *θ* changes a preceding *β* into *φ*; cf. the *χ* in *σεβαχθανεί*=שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, and Gram. d. j.-pal. Ar. 304. It is credible enough that those who understood Syriac only should have again transformed the Hebrew *ἀζαφθανεί* into Aramaic, read *ζαφθανεί*=זְעַזְּפַתָּנִי, and then translated *ὠνειδισάς με* with Cod. D Mark 15[34]. See *Chase*, The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels, 107.

[3] Of less consequence are the unmethodical investigations of *H. P. Chajes*, who, in his treatise "Markus-Studien" (1899), aims at showing that several *Hebrew* editions of the (assumed) Aramaic Logia were used by the Synoptists.

[4] Philologica sacra (1896), 55.

of Cod. D, *πολλῶν δὲ ὄχλων συνπεριεχόντων κύκλῳ ὥστε ἀλλήλους συνπνίγειν*, where the common text has, *ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους*. According to Blass, the latter was the older text of Luke, the former being the Roman edition as revised by him. Now, Nestle is of opinion that Luke first of all misread in his text רבבות, "myriads," but afterwards recognised that רבות was the right word. But the critic should then have said what he supposes to represent *ὄχλος* in the alleged source. Can עַמִּים רַבִּים have been confused with רְבָבוֹת עַמִּים? The question, moreover, is concerned not merely with *πολλῶν* and *μυριάδων*, but with the complete change in the expression of the thought, which is to be explained in the context. It remains, after all, most reasonable to suppose an undesigning alteration of the tenour of the whole sentence at the instance of a scribe who was not in the habit of slavishly binding himself to his exemplar in non-essentials. N. himself mentions the possible dependence of the manuscript on some gospel harmony, Philolog. sacra, 88.

A like conclusion will commend itself in the case of the readings Luke 22^{16} *πληρωθῇ* of the common text, and *καινὸν βρωθῇ* found in D and accepted by Blass. In Nestle's opinion, אָכַל, "to eat," and כָּלָה, "to complete," have come into collision; and he notes that the LXX, 2 Chron. 30^{22}, has *συνετέλεσαν* (ויכלו) in place of the ויאכלו of the Massoretic text.[1] In that passage, however, וַיְכַלּוּ may be the true reading, unless הַמּוֹעֵד, like חַג elsewhere, is to be understood of the offering at the feast. But what has this to do with Luke 22^{16}, where the question is concerned not with "eating" and "completing," but with "eating anew" and "fulfilling"? What we here find in Cod. D is merely a variant intended to explain the awkward *πληρωθῇ*, and suggested by Matt. 26^{29}, Mark 14^{25}.

[1] According to Philol. sacra, 38, N. no longer lays stress on the derivation of the reading from a Hebrew text, though still regarding it possible.

We cannot accept N.'s observation on Matt. 27[51], which makes *καταπέτασμα* depend on a misreading and mistranslation, and finds the true reading in the Gospel of the Hebrews, which, by the testimony of Jerome, made mention, not of the rending of the veil of the temple, but of the splitting of the lintel. כַּפְתֹּר, "lintel," he holds, has been read as פַּרְכָתָא, "curtain." But כַּפְתֹּר is nowhere found as the name for the lintel; it cannot therefore have stood for it in the Gospel of the Hebrews, especially as the latter was written in Aramaic. Perhaps its account was affected by the later ignorance of the fact that in the last temple the entrance to the sanctuary was closed by a curtain of extreme costliness, see Bell. Jud. v. v. 4. The New Testament expositors also usually neglect this consideration, so that the question has arisen how it was possible to observe the rending of the curtain, *i.e.* the one in front of the Holy of Holies. *τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ* is, however, the curtain at the entrance to the temple building, not that before the Holy of Holies, which would have to be otherwise designated.

The existence of a primary gospel in the Hebrew language had to be considered antecedently improbable, because no occasion was discovered for the use of this language. And if we have now succeeded in showing that the special Hebraisms of the Synoptic Gospels are to all appearance of Greek origin, that the attempts hitherto made to infer a Hebrew original from the variants in the Gospel texts are unsuccessful, and that signs are not wanting to show that the authors of our Gospels, in their present form at least, were not conversant with the Hebrew language, then it will no longer seem hasty if the title of this section spoke of "*alleged* proofs of a primitive Hebrew gospel."

VI. Testimonies in favour of a Primitive Aramaic Gospel.

Apart from the well-known testimonies in Eusebius, we have no certain traces of the existence of a primitive gospel in a Semitic language. It may now be considered an acknowledged fact that Jerome was mistaken, and that he himself latterly perceived his error in believing that the original of Matthew in Hebrew still existed in his day. The various forms of the texts of the Gospels in the Aramaic language, which are now known to us, are derived from Greek originals. Even the Aramaic Gospel of the Hebrews used by Jerome was to all appearance the reproduction of a Greek gospel. We learn incidentally from Eusebius[1] that the first Palestinian martyr, Procopius, had exercised in the service of the Christian community of Scythopolis the threefold office of Scripture-reading, Aramaic interpretation (ἑρμηνεία τῆς τῶν Σύρων φωνῆς), and exorcism. If the Reader of a Palestinian congregation was also Aramaic Interpreter, it follows that there could not have been in Palestine about 300 A.D. any Bible in the vernacular of the land. The reading of Holy Scripture in the Greek language was accompanied by an oral translation into Aramaic.

According to Eusebius, the Church in his time possessed a fourfold testimony in regard to a "Hebrew" original of Matthew, first in the form of a tradition to the effect that Pantænus had found such a work in India (Hist. eccl. v. 10), and next in the form of statements made by Papias, by Irenæus, and by Origen (Hist. eccl. iii. 39, v. 8, vi. 25). Eusebius believes that it is throughout the canonical Gospel of Matthew that is referred to, and could cite in his support the statements of Irenæus and Origen, who were of the same opinion. The declaration of Papias, however, is open to question, and would have had greater weight with us had

[1] *B. Violet,* Die palästl. Märtyrer des Eusebius von Cæsarea, 4, 7, 110.

we known in what connection it stood in his work. When he says of Matthew, *τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο* (*συνετάξατο*), one must naturally suppose he meant only a collection of "sayings." Papias' own work, from which Origen made this quotation, bore indeed the title *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, and contained accordingly expositions of those "sayings" of our Lord of which Matthew had made a "Hebrew" collection. Only from the unknown context might it *possibly* become clear that the work of Matthew contained anything besides *dicta*. The translator into Syriac, who straightway put down אונגליון for *τὰ λόγια*,[1] has certainly not given the exact sense of Papias within the limits expressed by him. From the statement of Papias, Resch, it is true, has derived the assumed title of his comprehensive documentary source of our Gospels דִּבְרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ, on the supposition that Papias meant by *τὰ λόγια* to represent precisely the above Hebrew title, and that the latter is in the last resort equivalent to "History of Jesus," just as in the Books of the Kings דִּבְרֵי פ׳ often refers to the acts and experiences of a king. But Papias gives no hint that *τὰ λόγια* was the title of the work of Matthew in question; and even if he so considered it, he would still in any case have understood it to refer only to the "sayings," not to the "deeds" or "life history," of Jesus.[2] But if this work of Matthew were composed in Aramaic, then a title such as פִּתְגָמֵי יֵשׁוּעַ or מִלֵּי יֵשׁוּעַ for a narrative gospel would be highly improbable.[3]

It is really an *Aramaic*, not a Hebrew original of

[1] So *Eusebius*, Hist. eccl. syr., edited by *P. Bedjan*, Paris, 1897; by *W. Wright* and *N. McLean*, Cambridge, 1898, without giving variants.

[2] Cf. the anonymous treatise, "The Oracles ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis," 1894, 48–91.

[3] Post-biblical Jewish literature recognises דִּבְרֵי פ׳ as a title of written works only in the sense that the contents are thereby referred to as the words of the person named in the superscription. A "History of Jesus" would have been called in Hebrew מַעֲשֶׂה יֵשׁוּעַ, in Aramaic עוּבְדָא דְיֵשׁוּעַ, as written by Shemtob Ibn Shaprut in the unprinted Eben Bokhan (MS. of the Jewish theol. Sem. in Breslau, f. 180ᵇ).

Matthew that is attested by the ancient tradition. This holds incontestably so far as Eusebius[1] is concerned, for, according to him, the apostles had been reared "in the Syrian language." Eusebius also alludes to the fifth word of Jesus on the Cross in its Aramaic form, speaking of it as "Hebrew."[2] In saying that Matthew, whom he elsewhere calls a "Syrian,"[3] first of all preached to the "Hebrews," and then on departing from them left behind with them his Gospel written πατρίῳ γλώττῃ, Eusebius means that Matthew had written down his Gospel in the mother-tongue common to himself and his kinsfolk, that is to say, according to Eusebius' own view of the linguistic situation of that period, in Aramaic. Eusebius, therefore, must have understood all the earlier statements communicated by him in regard to the language of the original Matthew as referring to Aramaic, and in this he was certainly not mistaken. In the case of Irenæus[4] we know for certain that he spoke of words which are Aramaic as being "Hebrew." But in all these notices the emphasis is not laid on the consideration that the work of Matthew had originally been written in Hebrew as opposed to "Syriac," but only on the fact that Matthew had composed his work in the language peculiar to the "Hebraists." Any one who, like Eusebius, is convinced that the mother-tongue of the "Hebraists" was Aramaic, can think of no other language in this connection.[5] It must be conceded that even if that work had for any reason whatever actually been composed in Hebrew, still the testimonies about it would scarcely have been expressed otherwise. But in virtue of this mere *possibility*, the testimonies do not become actual witnesses in favour of a primitive gospel in *Hebrew*. A treatise by Matthew in the Palestinian Jewish

[1] Demonstr. ev. iii. 7. 10. [2] Ibid. x. 8.

[3] Quæst. ev. ad Steph. in Mai, p. 27.

[4] Adv. hær. i. 21. 3; cf. Epiph. Hæres. xxxiv. 20.

[5] An Aramaic original Matthew is postulated also by *Th. Zahn*, Einl. in das N. Test. ii. § 54.

vernacular[1] is attested, but not a Hebrew Matthew. The conjecture that this treatise of Matthew was a collection of the sayings presupposed by the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke is an attractive one, but hitherto, at least, it has not been established by linguistic evidence. Indeed, it must be confessed that even if the sections common to Matthew and Luke did actually originate from that source, still it was at least not the Semitic original, but only a Greek translation, that lay before the evangelists.

The early Church testimonies in regard to the origin of Mark's Gospel would have considerable importance for our aim, provided that Mark, in his capacity of interpreter of Peter, were the same individual who was wont to translate the Aramaic discourses of Peter into Greek. In that case his Gospel, too, would go back to an Aramaic original, even though it were only orally formulated. Irenæus,[2] Clement,[3] and Eusebius[4] must, in fact, have so conceived the situation. But the oldest testimony on this point, that of the Presbyter in Papias,[5] is apparently intended to imply that Mark was only the author of a gospel which was founded on the spoken communications of Peter, Mark being thus in a sense his interpreter, even though he had never actually filled such an office in relation to Peter. In that case it would be most likely that Mark should proceed upon the Greek expositions of Peter, for Peter must have appeared (Acts 10^{24}) from a very early date as a preacher of the gospel in the Greek language. And thus a primary form in Greek would have to be assumed for the Mark document.[6] F. Blass,[7] who understands the statement of Papias to signify that Mark actually accompanied Peter as interpreter, holds indeed that

[1] This case is quite similar to that of the original of the *ἱστορία Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους* of Josephus, which was composed according to the preface in *τῇ πατρίῳ* (understand *γλώσσῃ*).

[2] Adv. hær. iii. 1. 3, x. 6.

[3] *Eusebius*, Hist. eccl. ii. 15, 16.

[4] Hist. eccl. iii. 14.

[5] Loc. cit. iii. 39.

[6] See also above, p. 42, and p. 49, footnote 2.

[7] *F. Blass*, Philology of the Gospels, 196, 210 ; cf. 194.

there existed an Aramaic original of Mark which was unknown to Papias, and of which traces may be recognised in the various readings of our manuscripts. He holds that Mark was also the author of the Aramaic source which he postulates for Acts 1–12. But such conjectures entirely abandon the region of what has been or can be proved.

Just as J. A. Bolten,[1] a century ago, had frequently endeavoured in the exposition of Matthew to recover the original Aramaic terms, so in recent times attempts have been made for particular passages of the Gospels to go back to an Aramaic original, in the first instance by J. T. Marshall,[2] and subsequently by E. Nestle,[3] J. Wellhausen,[4] A. Meyer,[5] and M. Schultze.[6] Wellhausen and A. Meyer aim chiefly at reaching the Aramaic word uttered by Jesus; Marshall and Nestle strive to demonstrate the existence of an Aramaic documentary source. Marshall has even believed himself in a position to furnish provisionally, as the result of his investigations, the content and limits of an Aramaic primary gospel.[7] Th. Zahn,[8] who considers our entire Gospel of Matthew to be a translation from the Aramaic, seeks support for this position especially from the style in which Semitic words are communicated.

In regard to Marshall and Meyer, it is here sufficient

[1] *J. A. Bolten*, Der Bericht des Matthäus von Jesu dem Messia, Altona, 1792; see *A. Meyer*, Jesu Muttersprache, 25, 105 ff.

[2] Expositor, Ser. 4, ii. 69 ff.; iii. 1 ff., 109 ff., 205 ff., 275 ff., 375 ff., 452 ff.; iv. 208 ff., 373 ff., 435 ff.; vi. 81 ff.; viii. 176 ff.

[3] Philologica sacra, Berlin, 1896. A collection of observations published in Christl. Welt, 1895 and 1896; Expositor, Stud. u. Krit., and other periodicals.

[4] Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Gött., 1895; Phil. hist. Kl. 11 f.; Gött. Gel. Anz. 1896, i. 265; Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi. 188–194.

[5] Jesu Muttersprache, Leipzig, 1896.

[6] Gram. der aram. Muttersprache Jesu (1899), 80–83, where Schultze aims at translating the words of the Lord into biblical Aramaic without discussing the question of the linguistic form of a primitive gospel.

[7] Expositor, Ser. 4, vi. 81 ff. See also *Resch*, Aussercanon. Paralleltexte, i. 157 f. Here may also be mentioned *W. C. Allen's* Essay, "The Original Language of the Gospel acc. to St. Mark," Expositor, Ser. 6, vi. 436–443.

[8] Einl. in das N. Test. ii. § 56.

to refer to the trenchant criticisms which their work has provoked.[1] Some of their points will claim attention at a later stage. Of far greater consequence are the pertinent observations of Wellhausen and Nestle, though even in their case we feel the absence of a careful separation of Hebrew and Aramaic possibilities. Wellhausen, indeed, considers that the Aramaic form of the primitive gospel has been established by general considerations, and does not require to be vindicated by fresh evidence.[2] He must, however, be reminded that the Jewish literature to this day is still mainly composed in Hebrew. For my own part I do not see more than a high probability for an Aramaic primary gospel, and dare not speak of a *certainty* resting on proofs. Further, the points urged by Zahn prove truly enough the existence of an Aramaic background to the Gospel accounts, but do not suffice to show convincingly the existence of a Gospel in the Aramaic language.

Genuine proofs of an Aramaic, as opposed to a Hebrew, written source of the Synoptists are the harder to produce, because the same idioms and the same construction of clauses as are found in Aramaic are possible even in biblical Hebrew, and still oftener in the style of the Mishna. A whole series of comments that could be made on the synoptic text would therefore apply equally to either language. But the previous attempts to adduce such proofs are defective on other grounds. To justify this view in detail, some observations by Wellhausen will first be examined, and then the remarks of Nestle, which are pertinent to the question.

Wellhausen claims that the striking variations *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην* and *καθάρισον*, Luke 11^{41} and Matt. 23^{26},

[1] See in opposition to Marshall, *W. C. Allen*, Expositor, Ser. 4, vii. 386–400, 454–470; *S. R. Driver*, ibid. viii. 388–400, 419–431; against Meyer, *J. Wellhausen*, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1896, i. 265–268; *G. Dalman*, Theol. Litzeitg. 1896, 477 ff., Lit. Centralbl. 1896, 1563 f.; *A. Merx*, Deutsche Litzeitg. xix. (1898) 985–991.

[2] Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, vi. p. v.

are derived from זכי, which means "to give alms" and "to cleanse." This instance seems an attractive proof expressly in favour of a written Aramaic source, as the Hebrew for "cleanse" would be טָהַר. W. in his discussion refers to my Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram., in which the meaning "to give alms" is authenticated for זכי. He further pleads the consideration that in the Arabic he has found the substantive "zakāt," which contains the root-form, while the corresponding form in Aramaic זְכוֹ seems to be wanting in the Jewish literature. But זְכוּתָא, like its Hebrew equivalent צְדָקָה, is quite common in this literature. It does not matter much that זְכוּתָא does not appear to occur in connection with alms, since even then it would not lose the sense of "practice of virtue," "meritorious action"; cf. מִצְוָתָא, "practice of the commandments" for "alms" (Vay. R. 34). The verb זכי can mean "to act meritoriously by giving alms," but also "to procure [for another] that merit by asking alms" (see j. Pes. 31[b]). But why should Luke not have arrived at his expression by starting from the Greek *καθάρισον*? The purifying of the cup filled with plunder could be brought about only by its being emptied, the contents being given away. It coincided with the intention of Jesus if His saying were applied to almsgiving. According to the reading *τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν* in Luke 11[39], the idea implied would indeed be that what was latent in the heart of the Pharisees should be distributed like alms. But as an idea so absurd cannot be attributed to the evangelist, we should, like Blass, read *ὑμῖν*.

In Luke 24[32] Wellhausen is quite justified in retracing, as Mrs. A. S. Lewis does, the readings *καιομένη* and *βεβαρημένη* back to יקיד and יקיר. He has not, however, noted that the lucid *βεβαρημένη* adopted by Blass is disclosed to view solely through early versions. It would never have stood in the (primitive) Greek text. The interchange of יקיד and יקיר on the part of Syrians might very easily happen, because

in Syriac ד and ר are distinguished solely by the position of a diacritic point. But this does not touch the question of a primitive Aramaic gospel.

It is in itself an attractive conjecture that is made by W. in suggesting that in Luke 4^{26} the woman to whom Elias was sent should be characterised not as "a widow," ארמלתא, but as "a heathen," ארמיתא corresponding to the mention in ver. 27 of Naaman as *ὁ Σύρος*. Notwithstanding, I am unable to assent to it. To "the many widows in Israel" of ver. 25 there stands quite suitably in contrast "the widow of Sidonian Sarepta" of ver. 26. Besides, *πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν* is just as much occasioned by *γυναικὶ χήρᾳ*, 1 Kings 17^{9} LXX, as *Ναϊμὰν ὁ Σύρος* is by the like expression in 2 Kings 5^{20} LXX. So that there is really no call for emendation of the text.

Another phrase, which W. regards as an Aramaism, is *ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης*, Matt. 12^{41} (Luke 11^{32}). Its meaning must be, "they will measure themselves in the Judgment with this generation." But this form of expression is found in the Old Testament in Isa. 54^{17} תָּקוּם אִתָּךְ לַמִּשְׁפָּט, LXX *ἀναστήσεται ἐπὶ σὲ εἰς κρίσιν*, Targum יְקוּם עִמָּךְ לְדִינָא; also in Ps. 94^{16} מִי יָקוּם לִי עִם מְרֵעִים, LXX *τίς ἀναστήσεταί μοι ἐπὶ πονηρευομένους*. For the Jewish Aramaic compare also j. Kidd. 64^{a} חַד בַּר נָשׁ קָם עִם חַבְרֵיהּ בְּשׁוּקָא, "some one began a litigation with [rose up against] his neighbour on the street." Further, *κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν*, "they will show it to be in the wrong, will overcome it," need not be an Aramaism. W. connects it rightly enough with the Aramaic חַיֵּב, but we have a corresponding expression also in Hebrew in תִּרְשָׁיעַ; see Isa. 54^{17} תַּרְשִׁיעִי, LXX *ἠττήσεις*, Targum תְּחַיְּבִנֵּיהּ.

Just as little is it necessary to detect with W. an Aramaism in *ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ*, Matt. 18^{23}, along with which may be mentioned Matt. 22^{2}, where the same phrase is repeated, also Matt. 13^{52}, 20^{1}; cf. 21^{33} with *ἀνθρώπῳ*

οἰκοδεσπότῃ, and Luke 24[19] with *ἀνὴρ προφήτης*. The Old Testament says: כֹּהֵן אִישׁ, Lev. 21[9] (LXX *ἀνθρώπου ἱερέως*); אִישׁ נָבִיא, Judg. 6[8] (LXX *ἄνδρα προφήτην*); and in Jewish Aramaic literature the idiom is also found; see, *e.g.*, גְּבַר סָב, j. Sanh. 25[d], but I do not think it ever stands at the opening of a parable, as in Matthew. But *ἀνὴρ βασιλεύς* is, of course, good Greek, and *ἄνθρωπος βασιλεύς* also is not impossible.

In Mark 1[41] Cod. D has the unmeaning *ὀργισθείς* for *σπλαγχνισθείς* of the common text. Like J. D. Michaelis[1] a century ago, Nestle holds that in this case אתרחם, "he was moved with compassion," has been interchanged with אתרעם, "he was angry." That might well be correct, yet it would apply only to the Syriac of Edessa. In this instance we perceive the impression of Syriac influence on Cod. D, and that all the more surely because Ephrem knew this reading; see *Chase*, The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels, 88 f. This author, however, supposes that the confusion is between אתרחם and אתחמת.

The readings *ἔξω τῆς χώρας*, Mark 5[10], and *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, Luke 8[31], are by Nestle traced back to לתחומא and לתהומא, the former meaning "to the frontier," the latter "into the deep." As "to the frontier" did not suit the context, Mark, it is thought, changed it to "across the frontier." But without imputing an erroneous translation of this kind, the variation explains itself from the consideration that in Mark the idea was the removal of the demons to a distant land (cf. Tob. 8[3]), but in Luke their banishment to the place of chastisement for the reprobate. In Mark 5[11] (Luke 8[32]) a herd of swine is mentioned as being "beside" or "upon the mountain"; in Matt. 8[30] as being "a good way off from them" (*μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν*). Nestle holds that טוּרָא, "mountain," and טַוָּרָא, "distance," are here in confusion. But this טַוָּרָא is foreign to the Jewish Aramaic;

[1] Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Bundes, i. (1788) 585.

and the difference admits of another explanation. Mark and Luke represent the entire incident (Mark 5^2, Luke 8^{27}) as proceeding upon the seashore, the herd being in the immediate vicinity "upon the mountain." Matthew does not locate the episode on the seashore, but regards Jesus as being "in the country of the Gadarenes" on the way to Gadara (Matt. 8^{28}), which was situated some six miles inland. The herd of swine is supposed to be at some distance, because, as represented in ver. 32, it was necessarily near the seacoast.

In Matt. 5^{48} *τέλειοι, τέλειος* correspond to *οἰκτίρμονες, οἰκτίρμων* in Luke 6^{36}. From the Concordance N. finds that the LXX in certain circumstances puts both *ἵλεως* and *φίλος* for the Hebrew שלם, and he notes that in de Lagarde's "Onomastica Sacra" *Σολομών* is explained as *ἐλεήμων ἢ εἰρήνικος*. Therefore N. infers *οἰκτίρμων* presupposes an original שלם. But despite all this שלם does not mean "merciful," and could be so rendered only by a very slipshod translator. The expression in Luke is occasioned by the fact that the divine nature has just before been characterised as *χρηστός*. Matthew uses *τέλειος* beeause the conduct of men in other relations is forthwith to be mentioned, and it was necessary to provide for the transition.

The peculiar phrase in Mark 8^{10} *εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά*,[1] has been derived by J. Rendel Harris[2] from the Aramaic למנותא דלמנותא on the supposition that the second למנותא was an inadvertent repetition, while the real name of the place has disappeared. Nestle[3] has, independently of Harris, hit upon the same idea. To this, however, the serious objection has to be urged that *τὰ μέρη* with the meaning of "district" is a pure Græcism, quite incapable of being literally reproduced in Aramaic. מְנוֹתָא in all the

[1] See thereon Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 133.
[2] Codex Bezæ, 178.
[3] Philologica sacra, 17.

Aramaic dialects means "portions" but not "district." The Syriac translators were therefore obliged to substitute other expressions: thus we find in place of it אתרא, "region," Mark 8^{10} Pesh., Matt. 2^{22} Cur. Sin. Pesh., Matt. 16^{13} Cur. Pesh. Hier.; תחומא, "district," Matt. 15^{21} Cur. Sin. Pesh. Hier., Matt. 16^{13} Sin.; ארעא, "land," Matt. 2^{22} Hier. Nor in Jewish Aramaic would expressions other than these be possible. Therefore *Δαλμανουθά* cannot be explained by means of למנותא.

In Mark 10^{30} Jesus speaks of a "hundredfold" recompense for His disciples, whereas Matt. 19^{29} (Luke 18^{30}) mention a "manifold" recompense. Now Cod. D has "hundredfold" in Matt. also, and in Luke "sevenfold." In Nestle's opinion "sevenfold" was the original, and this has been received into the text of Blass. This may *possibly* be correct, but there is no necessity for deriving the expression from a Semitic original. Seven stands as a number suggesting completeness without mathematical precision, cf. the seven years of Anna's wedded life, Luke 2^{36}; the seven evil spirits, Luke 8^{2} 11^{26}; the seven brothers, Luke 20^{29}; the sevenfold daily trespass, Luke 17^{4}. In this way "manifold" and even "hundredfold" can be used in place of "sevenfold."

At the first glance there is something plausible in N.'s remark on Luke 19^{17}, that the mention of the "cities" as reward of the faithful servants in contrast with the "talents" of Matt. $25^{16ff.}$ is to be explained by interchange of בִּכְּרִין, "talents" and כַּרְכִין, "cities." On closer inspection, however, it becomes evident that this is not correct. כַּרְכִין is not the common word for "cities" in a general sense, so that the confusion was not so natural as might appear. In Matt. $25^{21.\,23}$ it is not "talents" that are given to the servants, but their Lord will set them over "many things." When Luke defines the "many things" by "cities," the addition depends on the fact that in his representation the

situation treats of a king who enters upon his dominion — an idea wholly absent from Matthew.

In Matt. 23[23] and Luke 11[42] ἔλεος and ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ should in N.'s opinion be traced back to one form with רחם as its root. His supposition is that רַחֲמִין, "compassion," and רַחֲמָתָא, "love," were confounded, τοῦ θεοῦ being appended to the latter. But it is at least equally credible that the Greek synonyms ἔλεος and ἀγάπη were interchanged, and that ἀγάπη was afterwards explained as "the love of God."

In Mark 11[4] ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου is represented as being properly the translation of Βηθφαγή, Luke 19[29]. This latter, it is said, in accordance with the Syriac בית פנעא, might in fact have been rendered "at the parting of the ways." But ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου means only "on the street"; פנעא is not the term for "a network of roads" or "cross-roads,"[1] either in the Syriac of Edessa or in the Palestinian Aramaic; and בֵּית is not used for בְּ in Palestinian Aramaic. Besides, Βηθφαγή has the indeclinable ending ē, and is, therefore, not of Greek origin. From the Talmud we learn that בית פאני was really the name of a place,[2] not of a cross-roads merely. So that Mark, if he translated, would have translated wrongly. If one is not content to derive פאני from פֶּגֶ, "unripe figs," as I have done,[3] then it is preferable to pronounce the origin of the word obscure[4] rather than to decide upon פנעא.

In Matt. 27[34] "vinegar mingled with gall" is put for the "wine mingled with myrrh" of Mark 15[23], through the confusion, as Nestle holds, of מרה, "gall," with מורה, "myrrh."

[1] The fact that the Syrians in one case attempt to assign the meaning "cross-roads" to בית פנא would have significance only if פנעא could be adduced with this meaning in other instances.

[2] But not of two places, as *Starck*, Palästina und Syrien, 35, represents.

[3] Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 152.

[4] Can πάγος, "village," perhaps be traced in the name? According to the Talmud, Bethphage was situated just beyond the city boundary of Jerusalem proper.

But Matthew's representation is satisfactorily accounted for through intentional allusion to the drinking of gall in Ps. 68^{22} LXX, and does not call for the assumption of a Semitic source.

In Acts 2^{47} Cod. D has *πρὸς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον* for *π. ὁ. τ. λάον* of the *Textus Receptus*. N. traces these variants to the confusion of עלם, "world," and עם, "people," and adduces other instances where this mistake occurs. He does not expressly say, however, whether he means that Luke had subsequently recognised his original reading עם to be incorrect, and, accordingly, in the revised edition had substituted *κόσμον* for *λάον*, or whether a later writer was the first to bring Luke's document into accord with the alleged source. In the text of the Palestinian Talmud, Ber. 4^{b} and Bab. mez. 8^{d}, we also find כולי עלמא wrongly put for כל עמא. For this, however, it is no mere misreading on the part of a copyist that is responsible, but the fact that both are quite equivalent periphrases for "every one," the former being the dominant Babylonian usage, the latter the Palestinian usage. Admitting, however, that כל עמא, "all the people," and כל עלמא, "the whole world," are merely different expressions for "every one," in the same sense as in Acts 2^{47}, the reading nevertheless allows of explanation without reversion to a Semitic original quite as satisfactorily through an interchange of the Greek terms, as is done by B. Weiss;[1] and there is no occasion to consider with Harris[2] a Latin, or with Chase[3] a Syriac text as responsible for the various reading.

The theory of a Semitic source is raised to "perfect certainty" in N.'s judgment by the various reading *ἐβαρύνατε*, "ye oppressed," supplied by Cod. D Acts 3^{14}, in place of *ἠρνήσασθε*, "ye denied," of the common text. Blass[4] appeals

[1] Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte (1897), 58.
[2] Codex Bezæ, 103 f.
[3] The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezæ (1893), 28.
[4] Philology of the Gospels, 194.

to this "discovery" of Nestle as the most important proof of the Aramaic source used by Luke for Acts 1–12.[1] כפר, "to deny," and כבר, "to molest," are supposed to have been interchanged in this case. Both by Nestle and Blass, therefore, *ἐβαρύνατε* will be reckoned a gross error. In the first edition of the Acts, Luke himself had fallen into this mistake: only in the second edition had he rectified it, after he had made a fresh study of his source. Now Blass, at least, according to whom Luke understood only a little Aramaic and no Hebrew at all, should hardly attribute to him any acquaintance with the Hebrew הַכְבִּיר, which occurs only in Job, and, moreover, is never used for "molest."[2] If, however, Luke were well versed in Hebrew, this peculiar freak, impossible from the Aramaic side, would be unpardonable. Long ago, however, Harvey,[3] and after him Chase,[4] had found a most satisfactory explanation of the reading of Cod. D, by referring it to the Edessene כבר, "to irritate," which could be interchanged with כפר, "to deny." Nestle[5] finds this also to be plausible, and, as it seems, would therefore consider it possible that Luke was familiar with the Syriac of Edessa, and thence arrived at his false reading. But far more acceptable would still remain the theory of Harvey and Chase, that the reading of Cod. D originates not from Luke, but from a defectively written or falsely read Syriac gospel text. And since "to be angry with" is in Edessene not כבר but אתכבר, Harris[6] will be right in saying that *ἠτήσατε* read as *ἠττήσατε* has been the source of the Latin reading *aggravastis*, which on its part again determined the Greek text of Cod. D.

[1] *B. Weiss*, Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte, 25, holds that *ἐβαρύνατε* may possibly have been an ancient reading, without giving any opinion on its genesis.

[2] The same would hold of the Edessene אכבר, "to make much ado."

[3] W. Wigan Harvey, Iren. adv. Hær. ii. (1857) 55.

[4] The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezæ, 38.

[5] Philologica sacra, 40 f.

[6] *J. Rendel Harris*, Codex Bezæ (1891), 162 ff.

If our criticism of the proofs hitherto adduced in support of a primitive Aramaic gospel be sound, then clearly the account of the primitive Church in regard to an Aramaic original of Matthew must be pronounced as still lacking confirmation by convincing proofs.

Since, however, the proofs of a *Hebrew* written source proved equally inconclusive, one is obliged to resort to the considerations urged long ago by B. Weiss and others, to the effect that the occasional agreement of the Synoptists in Greek expressions implies that the documentary sources used by them were written in Greek. In this there is nothing improbable. The Christian Church, even while in Jerusalem, included in its numbers numerous Hellenists, *i.e.* Greek-speaking Jews, Acts 6^{1} 9^{29}. From the very beginning it thus used two languages, and in gatherings of the community the deeds and words of Jesus must have been recounted in Greek and in Aramaic. The "Hebraists" would mostly all have understood some Greek, but the Hellenists very often no Aramaic or Hebrew. A gospel-source in Greek need not, by reason of its language, have been any later in origin than one written in a Semitic dialect. It is thus *possible* that the oldest Christian writing may have been composed in Greek; and its Semitisms, so far as they are not Biblicisms, are in that case due to the Aramaic oral archetype (*Urgestalt*) of the Christian tradition.

VII. The Problem before us and the previous Studies in the same Field.

If this work, as planned by the writer, is not to be reared from the outset on an unstable foundation, it cannot proceed, as the foregoing considerations show, upon the definite theory of a Semitic written source elaborated in our Synoptic Gospels. What is firmly established is only the fact that Jesus spoke in Aramaic to the Jews, and that the

original apostolic band at the beginning preached concerning Him—though not exclusively—in that language. For the words of Jesus only is an Aramaic original form incontestably secure; for them alone does the earliest Church tradition assert a written Semitic source. Hence arises for literary science the right and the duty of investigating *in what form the words of Jesus must have been uttered in their original language, and what meaning they had in this form for the Jewish hearers.* Of course absolute certainty in regard to minutiæ cannot possibly be expected concerning the precise form in which these words proceeded from the mouth of Jesus. But it will be recognised with greater certainty than heretofore how much there is in form and content that is specifically Greek, and what at least may be regarded as most nearly approaching to the original setting. The more one is convinced that the Gospels contain historically trustworthy communications in regard to the teaching of Jesus, the more important must it appear to get even one step nearer to the original by a fresh apprehension of His message in the light of the primary language and the contemporary modes of thought.

As the *words* of our Lord must thus be the proper subject of our study, it has, of course, to be kept in view that they are presented to us in writings whose authors have so recounted them that their individual apprehension of them, their style and mode of expression, have not failed to exert a certain influence. It follows, therefore, that the investigation should not be limited entirely to the speeches reported by a Synoptist. Whatever their writings may afford towards elucidating the words of Jesus must be sought out and applied for the end in view. In regard to the Johannine Gospel, its exclusion from the scope of the inquiry seems to us justified, because the author's individuality impressed itself so strongly on the Greek he wrote, that a reconstruction in Aramaic would here have too little prospect of success.

OF CALIFORNIA

But even those who may think differently will not gainsay that a separate treatment of the synoptic material, at least by way of introduction, is not only justifiable but requisite.

The remark which was made after the discovery of the Hebrew fragments of Ben Sira, that all the attempts to reconstruct the original had failed,[1] cannot be indiscriminately applied to every work of this kind. For the book of the son of Sirach was very obscure in the original language to begin with; and the extant early versions were defective in the highest degree. But in regard to the original of the words of Jesus and their rendering into Greek, no such assertion can be hazarded. Thought and expression in this case are clear and unmistakable, free from useless ornament and artificial elaboration. In this case, therefore, a retranslation will have better prospect of success. But even in the accounts of the evangelists themselves, emphasis must not be laid on the unessential details in the reported dicta, which each narrator in turn could represent with some variation, but only on the leading thoughts and pervading ideas. It were no small achievement to succeed in apprehending these, in the light of the Aramaic language and the contemporary circle of ideas, with increased precision and closer approach to the original sense. And such an aim must be pronounced quite attainable, provided it be pursued with the proper means.

It is obvious enough that a mere Aramaic translation of the words of our Lord, as given in the Synoptists, would have little scientific value. For it is precisely the untranslatable that has to be made intelligible. Where several renderings are possible, the reader must be made aware of this. When the choice falls upon a particular rendering, the reasons in its support must not be omitted. And the

[1] See specimens in *Cowley* and *Neubauer*, The original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus (1897), xviii.

work would be but half completed, if at the same time an adequate insight were not given into the significance of the newly recovered text, and the form thence acquired by the problems of exegesis. Nothing but a running commentary, which takes account of the tentative translations, can therefore appear adequate to the end in view.

No definite hypothesis in regard to the origin and mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels can be assumed as the basis of our inquiry, without thereby anticipating conclusions which may appear as a possible result of the investigation. Only the various contingencies involved must not be left out of view. Naturally all questions of exegesis and gospel criticism are not intended to receive final solution; here the aim is rather to offer materials and indicate points of view which suggest themselves in considering the Aramaic archetype, and in reviewing the contemporary ideas. To New Testament science remains the task of applying our results to the working out of its own problems, and of thus conducting the inquiry to its proper goal.

As a number of ideas of substantially the same import recur throughout the discourses of Jesus, it will be desirable to begin by submitting the most important of these to a special consideration. The discussion of the words of Jesus in relation to their collective import will subsequently afford an occasion in later volumes of this work to add, if necessary, more precise definitions, and also to treat other ideas according to the same method. Thus our researches will also be guarded against a false Judaising of the words of Jesus, such as easily arises and often has arisen, where isolated dicta, separated from their context, have been compared with rabbinic ideas and expressions. Further, the theory which has been advanced, *e.g.*, by Schnedermann,[1] that Jesus at first began His work with Jewish ideas and then gradually charged these with a new content, cannot justify itself in presence of

[1] Die Vorstellung vom Reiche Gottes, i. (1896), ii. 1 (1893), 2 (1895).

the Gospel accounts.[1] For there the teaching of Jesus, extending only over a short period of time, appears, in regard to the fundamental conceptions, uniform and unvarying. Each single idea must be apprehended in its coherence with the whole. What we deem of real significance and worthy of our investigation, is not the superficial notion of a casual hearer of Jesus, but the intimate understanding of a constant disciple and follower.

It is regrettable that there are so few previous studies from which material directly contributory to our aim can be derived. Even after the dictionaries of Levy, Kohut, Jastrow have been supplemented by my own works, "Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch," and "Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Wörterbuch," there still remain large blanks in regard to the syntax, phraseology, and vocabulary of the separate dialects. Compilations begun by me, and to be rendered more complete by continuous reading, must serve to supply the deficiency.

The absence of preliminary studies in the region of *Jewish Theology* is no less marked. Even an adequate treatment of the ideas of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is not yet to be had. *M. Vernes*, Histoire des Idées Messianiques (1874); *J. Drummond*, The Jewish Messiah (1877); *V. H. Stanton*, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah (1886); *Oehler v. Orelli*, art. "Messias," Prot. Real-Encyklopädie,[2] ix. (1881), 641–672; *E. Schürer*, Geschichte des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,[3] ii. (1898), Section on the Messianic Hope, 496–556; *M. Marti*, Geschichte der israelit. Religion[3] (1897), 270–310; *R. H. Charles*, Eschatology of the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Liturature, in Dictionary of the Bible, i. (1898), 741–749, and Critical History of the doctrine of the Future Life (1899); *E. Hühn*, Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitischjüdischen Volkes bis zu

[1] Against Schnedermann, see especially *E. Haupt*, Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synopt. Evangelien (1895), 63 ff.

den Targumim, i. (1899)—after all these a good deal remains to be done. The commentaries, however, of *Ryle* and *James* on the Psalms of Solomon (1891), of *R. H. Charles* on the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (1893), on the Apocalypse of Baruch (1896), on the Assumption of Moses (1897), and especially the translations and expositions of these books published in 1900 by *E. Kautsch*, "Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments," must be regarded as a gratifying advance on their predecessors. Yet nearly all even of the authors here mentioned are lacking in a first-hand acquaintance with the later Jewish literature—an indispensable requirement where the problem is to elucidate Jewish writings whose Hebrew original has first to be ascertained.

In regard to the special rabbinic literature, it would be particularly desirable to know what it has to say as to the religious ideas of the Jews at the beginning of the second century of our era—the earliest period for which it affords intimate and reliable information. *F. Weber's* "Jüdische Theologie," even in the second edition (1897),[1] freed as it has been by I. I. Kahan from not a few defects, here leaves one quite in the dark through failing to supply the necessary separation of the earlier from the more recent, of the Palestinian from the non-Palestinian, as well as through the lack of a more thorough treatment of details. The "Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud," with its supplements (1884–1900), by *J. Hamburger*, is altogether a mere accumulation of unsifted material, the several items of which require first to be verified. "Der Leidende und der sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristl. Jahrtausend"—a treatise published by myself (1888)—endeavours to give reliable data on one important topic. Apart from the concise and excellent monograph of *D. Castelli*, Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei (1874), the only works that attain the level worthy

[1] See my review in Theol. Litbl. 1897, col. 382 f.

of the theme are the treatises[1] of *W. Bacher*, which are far too sparingly used by theologians—"Die Agada der Tannaiten" i. (1884), ii. (1894); "Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer" i. (1892), ii. (1896), iii. (1899).[2] After their completion by the anonymous Haggada of Palestine, these works will form a valuable thesaurus of the dicta of the Palestinian Rabbis, and furnish the means of attaining a real "theology of the early Palestinian synagogue."

Specially useful help should have been obtainable from the collections of rabbinic parallels to New Testament passages which have been prepared by Christians and Jews in early and in recent times. Among Christian works of this class may be named: *Joh. Lightfoot*, Horæ hebraicæ et talmudicæ in quatuor Evangelistas, published by J. B. Carpzov, Leipzig, 1684; *Christ. Schöttgen*, Horæ hebraicæ et talmudicæ in universum Novum Testamentum, Dresden-Leipzig, 1733; *Joh. Gerh. Meuschen*, Novum Testamentum ex Talmude et antiquitatibus Hebræorum illustratum, Leipzig, 1736; *J. Jak. Wettstein* (Wetstenius), Novum Testamentum Græcum, Amsterdam, 1751, 1752; *F. Nork*, Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen zu neutestamentlichen Schriftstellen, Leipzig, 1839; *Franz Delitzsch*, Horæ hebraicæ et talmudicæ in Luth. Zeitschrift, 1876–8; *Carl Siegfried*, Analecta Rabbinica, 1875, Rabbinische Analekten, Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. 1876; *A. Wünsche*, Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch, Göttingen, 1878.

Of Jewish productions, which, chiefly with an apologetic aim, institute comparisons between rabbinic and New Testament sayings, there may be cited: *M. Duschak*, Die Moral der

[1] In order to call increased attention to Bacher's writings, as well as to set a better example in citing rabbinic sayings than that now prevalent in the commentaries, I shall make frequent reference to these writings, although for my own work they were not, properly speaking, a source.

[2] "Tempus loquendi. Über die Agada der palästinischen Amoräer nach der neuesten Darstellung" (1897), by *M. Aschkenaze*, is intended to be a criticism of vol. ii. der Ag. d. pal. Am. The author, however, demonstrates only his own amazing ignorance.

Evangelien und des Talmud, Brünn, 1877 ; *E. Schreiber*, Die Principien des Judentums verglichen mit denen des Christentums, Leipzig, 1877 ; *E. Soloweyczyg*, Die Bibel, der Talmud und das Evangelium, the German by M. Grünwald, Leipzig, 1877 ; *E. Grünebaum*, Die Sittenlehre des Judenthums audern Bekenntnissen gegenüber, 2nd ed., Strassburg, 1878 ; *S. Blumenau*, Gott und der Mensch, in Aussprüchen der Bibel alten und neuen Testaments, des Talmud und des Koran, Bielefeld, 1885.

Nearly all these works, however, are found to contribute only occasional observations. The relation of any particular case to the whole data in the domain of Rabbinism is not systematically set forth. Moreover, agreement and divergence between New Testament and rabbinic statements are not determined with sufficient care. These comparisons have thus caused in many minds an impression, very unfavourable to scientific progress, that little of fundamental importance is to be learned from such parallels. Such a book as *Wünsche's* "Neue Beiträge," by reason of quite superficial and inaccurate assertions and faulty translations, must even be characterised as directly misleading and confusing. It is obvious enough, further, that Jewish handling of the material for polemic purposes is hardly calculated to demonstrate the real difference between the words of Jesus and the sayings of the Rabbis.

No other course is open but to supply the deficiency in this case also by independent work on the post-canonical literature of the Jews. Our discussion will consequently be encumbered by researches which might well have been conducted elsewhere ; but I trust it will not appear a blemish if Jewish materials, which may ultimately render important service in various ways to Biblical Theology, should here be found collected and sifted.

VIII. The Selection of the Dialect.

A serious difficulty in the way of our investigations consists in deciding the dialect of Aramaic, which they shall presuppose. There is no justification indeed for Th. Zahn's[1] misgiving that the distinction, adopted in my Grammar, of a "Judæan" and a "Galilean" dialect of Jewish Aramaic rests upon uncertain grounds. The two dialects so designated are so sharply defined in point of grammar and vocabulary, that their separation did not call for the exercise of exceptional penetration. But in applying these designations, nothing is fixed in regard to the time when these dialects flourished, and the extent over which they then prevailed. The "Judæan" dialect is known to us from literary remains of Judæan origin in the period from the first to the third (Christian) century; the Galilean dialect from writings of Galilean origin in the period from the fourth to the seventh century. That the "Galilean" at the time of its dominance among the Jews of Galilee was accompanied in other parts of Palestine by sister-dialects closely akin, is proved by the Samaritan Aramaic, and the still more closely related Christian Palestinian Aramaic. This latter had even extended its sway into Egypt, as is proved by the liturgy for the Blessing of the Nile, brought to light by G. Margoliouth.[2] Aramaic was not merely a Church language in that region, for in commenting on Isa. 19^{18}, Jerome explicitly states that there were still, as was well known, five cities in Egypt in which "the language of Canaan, namely the Syriac," was spoken.[3] On the other hand, the Palmyrene and Nabatæan Aramaic about the time of Christ must be pronounced as standing closer to the "Judæan" than to the "Galilean"

[1] Einleitung in das Neue Testament, i. (1897) 19.

[2] G. Margoliouth, The Liturgy of the Nile (1896).

[3] *S. Krauss*, Jew. Quart. Rev. vi. (1894), 249, strangely considers, despite the unmistakable statement of Jerome, that the Coptic language is meant. "Syriac" being the Semitic language of Canaan in his own day, Jerome finds

dialect. It has, however, to be taken into account that our knowledge of the Aramaic of Palmyra and Nabatæa is derived exclusively from inscriptions, while the "Galilean" is a popular dialect elevated to a literary language.

One will best do justice to the ascertainable situation in saying, that in the time of Christ there was prevalent over all Palestine, from the extreme north to the south, a single literary language in Aramaic, varying but slightly in the different parts of the country. In this literary Aramaic are written the Aramaic sections in Daniel and in Ezra, the Targum of Onkelos, and the other documents assigned to the Judæan dialect,[1] as well as the Palmyrene and Nabatæan inscriptions. Concurrently (with this literary dialect) there existed a whole series of popular dialects: a Middle Palestinian, which we can recognise in a later phase as Samaritan Aramaic, and a North Palestinian, which is known to us in a Jewish and a Christian form—both belonging to a subsequent period. It is highly probable that after the final overthrow of the Judæan centre of Jewish-Aramaic culture, which was the result of the Bar Kochba revolution, the North Palestinian popular dialect got the upper hand over nearly all Palestine.

According to Matt. 26^{73} (Mark 14^{70}, Luke 22^{59}), Peter was recognised in Jerusalem as a Galilean on the strength of a few words, and was consequently termed a companion of Jesus. It must therefore be inferred that Jesus was likewise recognisable by His language. We must not, through following the Galilean dialect as known to us, explain this incident from the consideration that the Galileans were accustomed at a later period to soften the gutturals. Peter's denial contained the expression *οὐκ οἶδα*, "I do not know,"

Isaiah's prophecy fulfilled in the "Syriac" speaking inhabitants of Egypt. His description of the "Canaanitic" as occupying a position between the Hebrew and the Egyptian, and as being closely akin to Hebrew, corresponds only with what he calls "Syriac," but not with the Coptic language.

[1] Enumerated in Gram. d. j.-pal. Aram. 5–12.

or "I do not understand," Matt. 26[70] (Mark 14[68], Luke 22[57]). In Galilean this would be לֵית אֲנָא חָכֵם or לֵינָה חָכֵם, but in Judæan לֵית אֲנָא יָדֵע. In their use of the Galilean dialect there was nothing in any way inviting disparagement towards Jesus or His disciples. The anecdotes told in Babylon centuries later, b. Erub. 53[b],[1] about the speech of uneducated Galilean women, must be regarded as a caricature of the truth even in their own late period. The Galilean as it is known to us from written works bears as yet no trace of decay or of corruption from outside influence. It is true only that certain signs of more advanced development as compared with the Judæan dialect may be detected in it. It cannot, however, be regarded as a later phase of the latter dialect. It is, of course, not unlikely that the language of Galilee underwent some changes between the time of Jesus and the fourth century. The pronunciation, the formation and scope of words, were in the earlier period indeed nearer by some degrees to the Judæan. For our purposes the scope of terms is of principal importance; and in that respect there can be no doubt that the number of Greek loan-words had increased, while it is highly probable that new Aramaic words from the north-east had found their way in and obtained currency by extruding others. Moreover, the possibility must not be excluded that Jesus, when speaking publicly, sought to conform to the Judæan dialect. If the Galilean taxgatherer Matthew really recorded the words of Jesus in Aramaic, it is most probable that he should avail himself of the literary language of Judæa, and not of the Galilean popular dialect. To all appearance his book was least of all addressed to Galilean readers.

[1] Compare on this point Gram. d. j.-pal. Aram. 43 f., where I have shown that the defective pronunciation of the gutturals cannot have been developed so markedly in the earlier period even in Galilee. Among the Babylonian Jews the change had gone much further; see *C. Levias*, A Grammar of the Babyl. Talmud, Am. Journ. Sem. Lang. xiii. 29 f.

It might seem as if the linguistic basis presupposed in our work were indeed highly uncertain. To a certain extent this is true. Any investigator who will be conscientious and sure of his steps, must take into consideration the whole field of linguistic possibilities lying between the biblical and the Galilean dialects of Aramaic.[1] The Judæan term must be considered side by side with the Galilean. And yet it will appear that the area of language coming into question is comprised within very narrow limits, and that most of the competing options that arise are of little or no weight in determining the exegesis. On the whole, the uncertainty as to language in this case is less considerable than that which confronts the translator of the Gospels into Hebrew, who, finding the biblical Hebrew impracticable, tries to steer a middle course between the language of the son of Sirach and that of the Mishna.

It is to be regretted that the most extensive literary monument of the *Judæan* dialect is a *Targum*. Translations of sacred books attached themselves then even more closely than now to the verbal tenour of the original. The Greek translation of the LXX is already an illustration of this tendency, and it was afterwards surpassed in that direction by the translation of Aquila. The method of Aquila's translation was further repeated in the probably contemporary Targum of the Pentateuch, which, by a curious accident, was adorned in Babylon with the name of Aquila in the form of "Onkelos." Only there resulted in that case, owing to the kinship of Aramaic and Hebrew, a linguistic product which was not quite so peculiar as in the Greek work of Aquila. By comparison with the other literary remains of Jewish Aramaic, it may, however, be

[1] *M. Schultze*, in his "Grammatik der aram. Muttersprache Jesu" (1899), has dealt exclusively with the biblical Aramaic, but has furnished it with a vocalisation based upon the biblical transliteration of Semitic names, and representing, as the author intends, the Galilean pronunciation.

determined with sufficient certitude what should be regarded as Hebraisms in the Targum. Genuine Aramaic is, of course, most clearly recognisable in cases where the Targum, despite its aim of precisely copying the original, finds itself constrained to adopt divergences in style.

The following may be specified as *Hebraisms* which essentially determine the style of the Targum: (1) the frequent use of the construct state, whereas an Aramaic original would have employed more commonly the circumlocution with דְּ; (2) the regular use of the separate יָת as substitute for the Hebrew accusative particle, whereas Aramaic consistently dispenses with such a particle; (3) the reproduction peculiar to the Targum of the biblical כְּי, in all its meanings, by אֲרֵי,[1] which latter is known in the Hebrew of the Mishna in the form הֲרֵי, restricted to the meaning "see," and which in the remaining Aramaic literature is wholly wanting in this sense; (4) the emphasising of the verb by apposition of the infinitive; (5) the use of the Aramaic וַהֲוָה for the Hebrew narrative formula וַיְהִי, which is foreign to Aramaic; (6) the use of the verb מַלֵּל for the Hebrew דִּבֶּר in all cases of its occurrence, and of לְמֵימַר for the Hebrew לֵאמֹר; (7) the frequent employment of the Perfect as historic narrative tense where the Aramaic would have had recourse to the Participle, either by itself or preceded by הֲוָה; (8) the common use of the Infinitive with prepositions, where Aramaic would have formed a subordinate clause with דְּ.

In regard to Nöldeke's[2] assumed disfigurement of the Targum of Onkelos by the Babylonian dialect, I am still unable to cite a single case in point except the occasional use of infinitive forms in *ō-ē*.[3] One instance may show how careful we should be in putting forward any such assumption.

[1] See Gramm. d. j.-pal. Aram. 186 f., 190 f.; *Nöldeke*, ZDMG xxii. (1868) 489.

[2] *Th. Nöldeke*, Die semit. Sprachen, 32.

[3] Gram. d. j.-pal. Aram. 225 ff.

The Palestinian Abbahu says, b. Sukk. 5^{b}, that the name given to a "boy" (יְנוּקָא) in Babylon was רָבְיָא. Now the Onkelos Targum uses רָבְיָא for "boy," while the Galilean dialect does not employ this word. But since the Mishna attests the corresponding Hebr. רוֹבֶה and the Samaritan likewise knows רָבִי, it is clear enough that רָבְיָא was not unknown in Palestine. Thus, when it occurs in Onkelos, the word should not be styled as a Babylonian intrusion.

The regrettable defect of the Judæan Aramaic above referred to, is in some measure compensated by our having the *Galilean* dialect made known to us almost exclusively through the short stories interspersed in the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash; and these stories bear throughout the mark of their artless popular origin. In this case we are furnished with what is so much missed in regard to the Samaritan, the Christian-Palestinian, and the earlier Syriac of Edessa, namely the really living speech of the people. By comparing this vernacular with the biblical Aramaic and the idiom of the Judæan documents (apart from the Targums), we have the only possible means of learning what was the style and mode of expression of the Jewish Aramaic of Palestine.

If the view put forward by Nöldeke, Buhl, Cornill, Ginsburger,[1] and others were correct, that the so-called *Jerusalem Targums* of the Pentateuch include sections from a very ancient and possibly pre-Christian period, then these, after deduction of the Hebraisms, would, of course, represent the best model for our work. Regard for this possibility caused me to give a prominent place in the Gram. des jüd.-pal. Aramäisch to the grammatical material in these Targums. But from that scrutiny I became convinced that the most primitive elements in regard to linguistic development to be found in these Targums are exactly the parts taken from the

[1] *M. Ginsburger*, Zum Fragmententargum, Jüd. Monatsschr. xli. (1897) 289–296, 340–349.

Onkelos Targum.[1] The style of these Targums had not as yet been closely studied, and theories regarding their origin had been based chiefly on the nature of their contents. But even on that ground I could discover no sound proofs of a great antiquity. As one passage from the Jerusalem Targum I. has been relied upon as a decisive evidence of its pre-Christian elements, it requires to be mentioned. In Deut. 33^{11} the words run thus: "Bless, O Lord, the possession of the Levites, who give the tithe of the tithe, and graciously accept the offering of Elijah the priest, which he presents upon Mount Carmel; break asunder the loins of Ahab his enemy, and the necks of the false prophets who withstand him, and let there not be to the foes of Yokhanan the high priest a foot to stand upon." Now as John Hyrcanus was less favourably remembered among the Jews at a later date, this statement, it is held, must have originated soon after his own time, and have been written by those who were among his partisans. By these, one would presume, are meant the Sadducees, a fact in itself suspicious. But one who is familiar with the nature of these Targums will think first of a Midrash which applied the words of Scripture to John [Yokhanan]. At the most, therefore, we should have before us traces of a very old Midrash. As to the age of the Targum passage, nothing could be concluded. But we are not unacquainted with the Haggada which is here alluded to. The Midrash on Ps. 67, in speaking of the verse in question, says the Greek domination was destined to fall by means of the tribe of Levi; and in the Midrash on Genesis (Bereshith Rabba 99) it is also said, with reference to this verse, that the Greek domination was destined to fall by means of the sons of Hasmonai, because they were of Levitic descent. Accordingly the enemies of Yokhanan in the Targum are the Greeks (Syrians), and any one who has read the Roll of the

[1] See Gram. d. j.-pal. Aram. 21–26; and *J. Bassfreund*, Das Fragmenten-Targum zum Pentateuch (1896), 65 ff., 98.

Hasmonæans is aware that for the Jews the high priest Yokhanan, *the son of Mattathias*, was the most conspicuous champion against the Greek oppressors, and the proper "Maccabean." None but he could be named if a personal representative of the Hasmonæan house in its struggle against Greece had to be cited.[1] Since, however, the representations given in the very late Roll of the Hasmonæans are wholly unhistorical, the passage in question becomes in reality an evidence for the late date of the Jerusalem Targum I. It is only in so far as they are evidence of an early form of the Onkelos Targum, and in so far as the Galilean dialect is traceable in them, that the Jerusalem Targums of the Pentateuch can yield us any assistance. The want of due precaution in the use made of them by J. T. Marshall is one of the things which were bound to render his efforts to reproduce the "Aramaic Gospel" a failure.

The Palestinian Lectionary of the Gospels, along with the other biblical lessons extant in the same language,[2] would, owing to the close relationship of its dialect with the Galilean, offer inestimable service towards the recovery of the Aramaic original of the words of Jesus, if it were not, like all the other ancient translations, merely a Targum, *i.e.* an imitation of the Greek original in the Aramaic dialect of the Christians of

[1] Rabbinic tradition, by the way, elsewhere distinguishes "the high priest Yokhanan" (Hyrcanus) from "King Yannai" (Alexander Jannæus). To the former a series of praiseworthy acts are ascribed, the only complaint being that he finally became a Sadducee; the latter ranked as really impious. Raba b. Ber. 29ª declares explicitly: "Yannai was an ungodly man from the beginning, but Yokhanan was a pious man from the beginning." It was Yokhanan who was informed by a divine voice in the temple of the victory of the "boys" in Antioch (j. Sot. 24ᵇ).

[2] The parts of the Scripture from the Old and the New Testaments, which had been published up to September 1897, are enumerated by E. Nestle in Studia Sinaitica vi., A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, edited by *Agnes Smith Lewis*, xiv. ff. Since then has been added *G. Margoliouth*, The Palestinian Syriac Version of the Holy Scriptures, four recently discovered portions, London, 1897, and the excellent new edition of the Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum by *Agnes Smith Lewis* and *Margaret Dunlop Gibson*, under the title "The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels," London, 1899.

Palestine. The slavish nature of the imitation is illustrated, *e.g.*, by the fact that the verb, with trifling exceptions, has no pronominal suffixes attached, because the Greek language only uses the personal pronouns independently.[1] For that very reason, however, this version, in parts where it does diverge from the tenour of the Greek, indicates all the more surely such Greek constructions as were repugnant to the Aramaic language. Besides, there is some suspicion that the Palestinian Gospel Lectionary has been influenced in its vocabulary by the Syriac version of Edessa. Unfortunately the "Idioticon des christlich-palästinischen Aramäisch" (1893), by *F. Schwally*, gives no light on this, as on other important points. Schwally has aimed at collecting the differences in the matter of vocabulary between the Christian Palestinian and the Edessene. But one does not learn what words are common to the two dialects, or which of such words in their turn are not found in the Palestinian Aramaic known from other sources.[2] It is not the ecclesiastical Aramaic of Palestine that can give any assistance, but only the idiom thence ascertained which was actually spoken by the Palestinians. A service similar to that of the Palestinian Lectionary is rendered also by the Edessene version in its various recensions now known to us (Cureton., Sinait., Peshita). But no assistance derived from any of these Aramaic versions can be used towards the attainment of a genuine Aramaic diction, unless the same mode of expression can be attested in the Jewish Aramaic. If we were to make the Jerusalem Lectionary the basis of our investigation, as proposed by Wellhausen,[3] it would first be necessary to prove that in it, and not in the Jewish Aramaic, was the language of Jesus and the earliest apostles preserved. But this supposition cannot be seriously entertained. The

[1] *Nöldeke*, ZDMG xxii. (1868) 505 f.

[2] See the incomplete suggestions of *Nöldeke*, ZDMG xxii. (1868) 517, 522.

[3] Gött. Gel. Anz. 1896, 265.

Christian Palestinian literature is a clear proof that there was practically no spiritual intercourse between the primitive Aramaic-speaking Jewish-Christian Church and the Jewish people. The Church of the Greek and Edessene languages is the spiritual mother of the Palestinian-Aramaic communities. Their language contained, indeed, a number of Hebrew words which occur also in Jewish Aramaic. But the presence of the terms merely proves the influence of the language which had been spoken by the very numerous Jews in Palestine at a prior period. A Jewish derivation, such as Nöldeke[1] supposes, cannot be inferred from this circumstance. Even if it should have taken place, the Jewish elements would have been obliterated long before. If, further, any grave doubts may justly be entertained as to whether the Jewish Galilean of the year 400 was altogether similar to the language of Jesus, then by abandoning the field of the Jewish Aramaic every valid foundation would be wholly lost.

We shall therefore have every reason to guard against giving too much weight to the Syriac versions of the Gospels. The Targum of Onkelos and the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash remain our most important criteria. As the idiom of the first of these, whose vocabulary can also be tested by the Hebrew of the Mishna, represents in any case a stage of the language nearer to the time of Jesus, we shall attach ourselves principally to it, not failing, however, to note the divergences of the Galilean dialect. The vocalisation will be guided by the tradition as to the pronunciation represented in the Targum manuscripts from Yemen, with the exceptions specified in my "Aramäische Dialektproben," iv. ff., especially as regards the Galilean. It should be explicitly affirmed, however, that in many an instance a different pronunciation prevailed in the time of Jesus; cf. Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aramaic, 46, 48, 50 f., 59 ff., 64 ff.

[1] ZDMG xxii. 522 f., Die semitischen Sprachen (1887), 33.

FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS.

I. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

A. Sovereignty of Heaven, Sovereignty of God, Sovereignty.

The expression *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* is altogether peculiar to the Gospel of Matthew, of which it is as characteristic as is the cognate appellation *ὁ πατήρ* (*μου, ἡμῶν, ὑμῶν*) *ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς* (*ὁ οὐράνιος*).[1] Mark and Luke have uniformly, Matthew has rarely, *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*.

The Jewish expression[2] corresponding to *ἡ βασ. τ. οὐρανῶν* is in Aramaic מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא, in Hebrew מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם. In the latter it is worthy of notice that שָׁמַיִם is always without the article,[3] from which it appears that the Aramaic שְׁמַיָּא is in the definite form only because the indefinite form of this word does not occur in Jewish Aramaic. The Mishna says מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, *e.g.* Ber. ii. 2; and similarly without the article, מוֹרָא שָׁמַיִם, "the fear of God," Ab. i. 3; שֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, "the name of God," Sanh. vi. 4; בִּידֵי שָׁמַיִם, "through, by God," Sanh. ix. 6; on the other hand, invariably מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "from heaven," Sanh. x. 1; Ned. x. 6.[4] The difference is to be attributed to the fact that in the last-mentioned phrase the locative sense of שָׁמַיִם was still consciously

[1] Fundamental Ideas, VI.

[2] According to *Stave*, "Über den Einfluss der Parsismus auf das Judenthum" (1898), 180 ff., the Persian idea of the "Supreme Sovereignty" exerted some influence when the term originated. This is possible, but not necessary.

[3] See *Franz Delitzsch*, Neue Beobachtungen über hebr. Spracheigentümlichkeiten, v., Theol. Litbl. 1887, No. 48.

[4] See also Fund. Ideas, VIII.; *E. Schürer*, Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. 1876, p. 171 ff.; *Ch. Taylor*, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers[2] (1897), 67.

present, whereas, in the other cases, שָׁמַיִם is purely a substitute for "God." Compare, further, b. Mo. Kat. 15*a*, מְנֻדֶּה לְשָׁמַיִם, "one who is banished by God," and יְרַחֲמוּ עֲלֵיהֶם מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "mercy is shown to them from heaven."

Although מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא is thus tantamount to the "sovereignty of God," it does not thence follow that all trace of the thought, that in the phrase the dwelling-place of God was being named instead of Him who was there enthroned, must have been obliterated. Simeon ben Lakish, about 260 A.D., contrasted the "sovereignty of earth (מַלְכוּת הָאָרֶץ) with the "sovereignty of heaven" (מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם).[1] For him, therefore, "heaven" is in this case the dwelling-place of God. Similarly, the Babylonian saying,[2] מַלְכוּתָא דְאַרְעָא כְּעֵין מַלְכוּתָא דְרָקִיעָא, "the earthly government resembles the heavenly government," has regard to the seat of human kings, and of God. Again, Yokhanan ben Zakkai, about 80 A.D., makes mention of "the yoke of the heavenly sovereignty" (עוֹל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם) alongside of "the yoke of flesh and blood" (עוֹל בָּשָׂר וָדָם),[3] thereby bringing "God" into contrast with "men." The difference in the point of view is, however, of small importance, because in every case the "heavenly sovereignty," in contradistinction to the "earthly," is nothing else than the "sovereignty of God" as opposed to all human government. There is no ulterior idea present in regard to the derivation or the nature of the divine sovereignty. It can only be ascribed to unfamiliarity with Jewish phraseology, that it is still commonly the custom to see in ἡ *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* a reference to the transcendental character of the object so designated.[4] It is not the *βασιλεία* that

[1] Ber. R. 9. [2] b. Ber. 58[a].

[3] j. Kidd. 59[d]; see *Bacher*, Agada der Tannaiten, i. 30 f. Cf. in the mouth of Chanina (about 80 A.D.) the antithesis of עוֹל הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא and עוֹל בָּשָׂר וָדָם, Ab. d. R. Nathan, 30.

[4] See, *e.g.*, *V. H. Stanton*, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah (1886), 209; *W. Baldensperger*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu[2] (1892), 197 f.; *L. Paul*, Die Vorstellungen vom Messias und vom Gottesreich bei den Synoptikern (1895), 21 f.; *K. G. Grass*, Das von Jesus geforderte Verhalten zum Reiche Gottes,

is indicated as transcendent in this phrase, but the *βασιλεύς*. *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* is the sovereignty of the transcendent God. Least of all has the plural שָׁמַיִם—for which no singular form exists—anything whatever to do with the heavens being seven in number. A Hellenist might *possibly*, indeed, attach some such notion to the Greek *οἱ οὐρανοί*, but that is not a sufficient reason for imputing the idea to Matthew, who makes no allusion of the kind.[1] Evidence of the meaning attached by Jesus to the words *τῶν οὐρανῶν* is afforded also by the substitute *τοῦ θεοῦ*, which is used exclusively in Mark and Luke. The evangelists have clearly considered the two phrases as synonymous; and as they thus coincide with the Jewish meaning of the expression מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, it is safe to assume the same interpretation in the case of Jesus.

According to J. Weiss[2] and H. J. Holtzmann,[3] it was only Matthew who imputed the expression to Jesus, the original actually spoken being *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*. But modern misunderstandings of *ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν* render it only too credible that Mark and Luke, out of regard to heathen readers, avoided the specifically Jewish expression, and followed the Greek Bible, which mentions no "sovereignty of heaven," but only "the sovereignty of God." See Ps. 103^{19} $148^{11.\ 12.\ 13}$, Tob. 13^{1}, Wisd. 6^{5} 10^{10},[4] Ps. of Sol. 17^{14}, Dan. 3^{54} (Song of the Three Children). This is the usage also of the Targums, which put מַלְכוּתָא דַיְיָ where the Hebrew text speaks of Jehovah as being King (see below). Jesus will

Mitt. u. Nachr. f. d. ev. K. in Russl. 1895, p. 52; *H. J. Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutestamentl. Theologie (1897), i. 189 f.; *A. Meyer*, Die moderne Forschung über d. Gesch. des Urchristenthums (1898), 73.

[1] In opposition to Holtzmann, loc. cit. 191.

[2] *J. Weiss*, Die Predigt vom Reiche Gottes (1892), 9.

[3] Lehrb. d. neutest. Theologie, i. 191 f.

[4] *E. Issel*, Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im Neuen Testament (1895), 20, thinks that in this passage the "fulfilment of the Messianic promises" is implied by *βασιλεία θεοῦ*; it is, however, merely a glimpse given to Jacob into God's position as sovereign that is meant.

have preferred the popular expression because He also readily abstained from the use of the divine name.

No doubt can be entertained that both in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature מַלְכוּת, when applied to God, means always the "kingly rule," never the "kingdom," as if it were meant to suggest the territory governed by Him. For the Old Testament, see Ps. 103^{19} $145^{11.\,12.\,13}$, cf. Obad. ^{21}, Ps. 22^{29} (מְלוּכָה); for the Jewish literature, the instances to be cited later on.[1] To-day as in antiquity an Oriental "kingdom" is not a body politic in our sense, a people or land under some form of constitution, but merely a "sovereignty" which embraces a particular territory. We shall be justified, therefore, in starting from this signification of מַלְכוּת as employed by Jesus. Krop,[2] indeed, in his definition "un domaine à la tête duquel se trouve un roi," has regarded the locative as the primary sense of the expression. Bousset,[3] too, finds that only now and then does the sense "sovereignty of God" take the place of "kingdom of God," and he seeks for special reasons for this interchange. But it is more correct to regard, with B. Weiss,[4] as fundamental, the meaning, "the full realisation of the sovereignty of God," and then to adhere uniformly[5] to the term "sovereignty," so as never to lose sight of the starting-point. The German word "Herrschaft" (sovereignty) can also in a secondary sense denote a region, so that German is free from the embarrassment felt, *e.g.*, by Candlish,[6] who tried to alternate the words "reign" and "kingdom."

In two cases there occurs the expression *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ*

[1] See also Fund. Ideas, I. 8.—*E. Schürer*, Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. 1876, p. 183, defines מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם not quite accurately as the "kingdom in which heaven, *i.e.* the heavenly King, rules."

[2] *F. Krop*, La pensée de Jésus sur le royaume de Dieu (1897), 21 f.

[3] *W. Bousset*, Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz z. Judentum (1892), 97.

[4] *B. Weiss*, Lehrb. d. bibl. Theol. des N.T.[6] (1895) 46.

[5] This is advocated also by *K. G. Grass*, loc. cit. 50 f.

[6] *Candlish*, The Kingdom of God (1884), quoted by *Stanton*, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah, 217.

πατρός (αὐτῶν, μου), Matt. 13[43] and 26[29]. For the latter passage the parallels Mark 14[25], Luke 22[18] have τοῦ θεοῦ. It need cause no surprise that Jesus should occasionally avail Himself of this mode of expression, for He loved to characterise God as "Father."

In the same category should also be reckoned Matt. 6[33] (Luke 12[31]), where ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ points back to ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, ver. 32 (cf. Luke 12[30] ὑμῶν ὁ πατήρ); and also Matt. 25[34], where ἡ βασιλεία is unprovided with a further qualification only because, in view of its being prepared for "the blessed of My Father," the addition appeared unnecessary.

The question becomes more delicate when ἡ βασιλεία, in some cases where the context is not so obvious, appears to be without any supplement. This happens only in Matthew, and almost exclusively in composite expressions. Here we find: οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας,[1] 8[12] 13[38]; ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλείας, 13[19] (Luke 8[11] ὁ λ. τοῦ θεοῦ; Mark 4[14] ὁ λόγος only); and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, 4[23] (wanting in Mark 1[39], Luke 4[44]), 9[35] (wanting in Mark 6[6], Luke 13[22]), 24[14] (Mark 13[10] τὸ εὐαγγέλιον only, cf. Matt. 26[13], Mark 14[9]). Of these passages, however, 4[23] and 9[35] are due to the narrator. A fuller designation is not in itself impossible, as appears from τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, Matt. 13[11] (Luke 8[10] τὰ μ. τ. β. τοῦ θεοῦ, Mark 4[11] τὸ μυστήριον τ. β. τ. θ.).

When הַמַּלְכוּת is used in Jewish literature without further definition, what is meant is always the secular "government" for the time being, whether the ruler himself or merely the officials representing him be the object of attention. Compare, for example, the expression קָרוֹב לַמַּלְכוּת "connected with the (Roman) government," b. Sanh. 43[a];[2] b. Bab. k. 83[a]; cf. b. Sot. 41[b] with Ab. iii. 8 (Nekhonya ben ha-Kanna about

[1] Cf. on the expression, Fund. Ideas, I. 4c.

[2] It is incorrect to make this passage apply to a relationship with the royal family of the Jews, and to turn it into a proof of the Davidic descent of Jesus.

70 A.D.): "Every man, who takes upon himself the yoke of the Law, is set free from the yoke of the (foreign) government (עוֹל מַלְכוּת), and from the yoke of providing a livelihood" (עוֹל דֶּרֶךְ אֶרֶץ). See also Sot. ix. 17; j. Ber. 6ᵃ, 13ᶜ; j. Ter. 46ᵇ. In this case מַלְכוּת by itself cannot be supposed to represent the sovereignty of God. And as Jesus always uses, except in the instances given, fuller expressions, it should not be assumed that even for Him "the sovereignty" had as yet become an equivalent term for "the sovereignty of God." Within the Christian community, and specially the Greek-speaking part of it, this identification is more credible. And in it the terms used by Matthew will have been formed.

B. The Jewish use of the Idea.

The first consideration in the Jewish view is that the sovereignty of God is an eternal one. The Targum of Onkelos in Ex. 15[18] puts: "God . . . His kingly sovereignty endures for ever and ever" (יְיָ מַלְכוּתֵיהּ קָאֵים לְעָלַם וּלְעָלְמֵי עָלְמַיָּא), for the Hebrew יְהוָה יִמְלֹךְ לְעֹלָם וָעֶד, thus substituting for the personal terms of the text an equivalent of a more abstract character. This sovereignty began when Abraham made God known upon earth. In Siphre Dt. 113 (Fr. 134ᵇ) it is said: "Before our father Abraham came into the world, God was, as it were, only the king of heaven; but when Abraham came, he made Him to be king over heaven and earth." Thereafter at the Red Sea and at Sinai Israel gave allegiance to this sovereignty of God.[1] Thenceforward it has its earthly presence in Israel. It is to the sovereignty of God in this sense that Eleazar ben Azaria (about 100 A.D.) refers in a saying, which also shows the connection of the expressions "heavenly Father" and "sovereignty of heaven": "One should not say: I have no inclination for garments of mixed stuffs, swine's

[1] Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 67ᵃ.

flesh, forbidden wedlock; but one should say: I have indeed inclination for such things, but what shall I do when my heavenly Father has forbidden them to me? (מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה וְאָבִי שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם נָזַר עָלַי כָּךְ); [for thus are we taught,[1] Lev. 20[26]: 'and I have separated you from the peoples, that ye should be mine';—here we find him (*i.e.* man, according to the Scripture text) separating himself from transgression and thereby taking upon himself the sovereignty of God" (נִמְצָא פּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הָעֲבֵרָה וּמְקַבֵּל עָלָיו מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם).[2] According to Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 260 A.D.),[3] the proselyte who adopts the law thereby "takes upon himself the sovereignty of heaven." In the statement of Yokhanan ben Zakkai,[4] adduced on page 92, the Israelite who voluntarily becomes a slave for life declares that he renounces the yoke of the heavenly sovereignty (פָּרַק עוֹל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם), and takes upon himself the yoke of man (קִבֵּל עוֹל בָּשָׂר וָדָם). Here the sovereignty of God is called a yoke, because God is able to compel Israel, even against his will, to accept His service. In Siphra 112[b], He says to Israel: "In spite of you—do I set up My sovereignty over you" (עַל כָּרְחֲכֶם—מַמְלִיךְ אֲנִי מַלְכוּתִי עֲלֵיכֶם). How little of realistic mysticism is here asscociated with the sovereignty of God becomes clear also from the fact that the daily recitation of the "Shema," with the reading of Deut. 6[4–10] (where the One God requiring undivided love is acknowledged), is regarded as a continually repeated "taking upon one's self of the yoke of the sovereignty of God." In this sense Gamaliel II. (*c.* 110 A.D.) replied to those who maintained that as a bridegroom he was free from the duty of the reading of the Shema on the evening of his marriage: "I yield not to you in that—to lay aside even for one hour the sovereignty of God"[5] (לְבַטֵּל מִמֶּנִּי מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם שָׁעָה אַחַת). Joshua ben Korkha (*c.* 150

[1] This is wanting in Siphra, Venice edition (1545), ed. princ.
[2] Siphra, ed. Weiss, 93[d]; see *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 228.
[3] Tanchuma, ed. Buber, לך לכה 6; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. i. 374.
[4] j. Kidd. 59[b].
[5] Ber. ii. 5.

A.D.) says that in the recitation of the Shema, Deut. 6^{4-8} ought to precede Deut. 11^{13-21}, because the "yoke of the divine sovereignty" (עוֹל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם) must be assumed prior to the "yoke of the commandments" (עוֹל מִצְוֹת).[1] And the expression קִבֵּל עוֹל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם is found exactly as a designation for the recitation of the Shema, *e.g.* j. Ber. 4^a, 7^b.

Thus the sovereignty of God belongs, in the first instance, to the current age,[2] and is as yet fully acknowledged only in Israel. The future will, however, bring a fuller development. The present reveals in two directions an imperfect realisation of the idea. Israel is under foreign domination, and the peoples do not acknowledge the divine sovereignty. If the sovereignty of God is to appear in all its glory, Israel must be set free from the sway of the peoples, and the Gentile world be subjugated to God. The former is part of the common prayer for synagogues of the dispersion, being introduced in the eleventh petition of the "Eighteen Prayers": הָשִׁיבָה שׁוֹפְטֵינוּ כְּבָרִאשׁוֹנָה וְיוֹעֲצֵינוּ כְּבַתְּחִלָּה וְהָסֵר מִמֶּנּוּ יָגוֹן וַאֲנָחָה וּמְלוֹךְ עָלֵינוּ אַתָּה יְיָ לְבַדְּךָ בְּחֶסֶד וּבְרַחֲמִים [3] בְּצֶדֶק וּבְמִשְׁפָּט בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ, מֶלֶךְ אוֹהֵב צְדָקָה וּמִשְׁפָּט, "restore our judges as of old and our counsellors as in the beginning; put away from us sorrow and sighing; and be Thou alone King over us, O Jehovah, in mercy and compassion, in grace[4] and justice! Blessed art Thou, O Jehovah, a King who lovest grace and righteousness." Another prayer,[5] speaking of the full realisation of God's sovereignty over Israel, says: יִשְׂמְחוּ בְמַלְכוּתְךָ שׁוֹמְרֵי שַׁבָּת—כֻּלָּם יִשְׂבְּעוּ וְיִתְעַנְּגוּ מִטּוּבֶךָ, "they shall delight in Thy sovereignty—every one of those that keep the Sabbath day; they shall all be satisfied and refreshed in

[1] Ber. ii. 2.

[2] This is rightly affirmed by *S. Schechter*, Jew. Quart. Rev. vii. (1895) 195 ff.

[3] Thus in Seder Rab Amram, i. 8^a; but Machzor Vitry, 67, has וְצַדְּקֵנוּ בַּמִּשְׁפָּט, "and pronounce us free in the judgment."

[4] On this translation of צֶדֶק and צְדָקָה see my treatise, "Die richterl. Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testament," 5 ff.

[5] Seder Rab Amram, i. 29^b.

Thy goodness." To a later period belongs the divine word attached to Zech. 9[9] in Pesikta Rabbati, 159[a]. Speaking as the future King of Zion, God there addresses the pious in Israel thus: "Ye pious ones of the world! although, strictly speaking, I owe you words of praise, since ye waited for My law although not for My sovereignty (שֶׁחִכִּיתֶם לְתוֹרָתִי וְלֹא חִכִּיתֶם לְמַלְכוּתִי),[1] yet I swear to you that I will bear witness for good to every one who waits for My sovereignty, as it is said: 'Wait patiently for Me, saith Jehovah, against that day when I rise up as witness-bearer'—in favour of the sorrowful ones who mourn with Me over My ruined house and My desolated palace."

In regard to the future recognition of God throughout the entire Gentile world, the Sibylline Oracles, iii. 47, has the following: *βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποιει φανεῖται*; and iii. 76: *καὶ τότε δ' ἐξεγερεῖ βασιλήϊον εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις*. Joshua ben Khananya (*c.* 100 A.D.), speaking of the time when all service of other gods shall be abolished, says: "Then shall God alone be absolute in all the world, and His sovereignty will endure for ever and ever" (וִיהִי הַמָּקוֹם יְחִידִי בָּעוֹלָם וּתְהִי מַלְכוּתוֹ לְעוֹלָם וּלְעוֹלְמֵי עוֹלָמִים).[2] The "Kaddish"[3] prayer in Aramaic, dating back to a great antiquity, concludes with the wish: וְיַמְלִיךְ מַלְכוּתֵיהּ בְּחַיֵּיכוֹן וּבְיוֹמֵיכוֹן וּבְחַיֵּי דְכָל בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּעֲגָלָא וּבִזְמַן קָרִיב, "and may He (God) set up His sovereignty in your lifetime, and in your days, and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel, (yea) speedily, and in a time that is near."[4] What

[1] Cod. de Rossi, 1240, in Parma, has חיביתם both times; but the citation introduced at the end from Zeph. 3[8] proves that חכיתם must be meant.

[2] Mechilta, edition by Friedmann, 56[a]; see *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 147.

[3] On this see *Zunz*, Gottesdienstliche Vorträge,[2] 385; *Landshuth*, Seder bikkur cholim ma'bar jabbok we-sepher ha-chajjim (1867), lix.–lxviii.; *Dalman*, "Jüd. Seelenmesse und Totenanrufung," Saat auf Hoffnung, xxvii. (1890) 169 ff.

[4] So in Seder Rab Amram, i. 3[b], and in Machzor Vitry, 64. *Maimonides* (in Mishne Torah) after מַלְכוּתֵיהּ inserts וְיַצְמַח פֻּרְקָנֵיהּ וְיִקָּרֵב מְשִׁיחֵיהּ וְיִפְרוֹק עַמֵּיהּ, "and may He cause His redemption to spring up and His anointed to come near and ransom His people."

is then destined to happen is consistently detailed in the prayer עָלֵינוּ,[1] which originated in Babylon *c.* 240 A.D. In it the hope is expressed that God will ultimately "bring the world into order by means of His kingly sovereignty" (לְתַקֵּן עוֹלָם בְּמַלְכוּת שַׁדַּי), so that then "all shall submit themselves to the yoke of this sovereignty" (יְקַבְּלוּ כֻלָּם אֶת עוֹל מַלְכוּתֶךָ וְתִמְלוֹךְ עֲלֵיהֶם). The same sense appears in the ancient prayer:[2] מַלְכֵּנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יַחֵד שִׁמְךָ בְּעוֹלָמֶךָ יַחֵד מַלְכוּתְךָ בְּעוֹלָמֶךָ וְיַחֵד זִכָּרְךָ בְּעוֹלָמֶךָ, "our King, our God, make Thy name one in Thy world, make Thy sovereignty absolute (lit. 'one') in Thy world, and make absolute the remembrance of Thee in Thy world." Present and future are included in the doxology:[3] דַּיָּי הִיא מַלְכוּתָא בְּעָלְמָא הָדֵין וּבְעָלְמָא דַּעֲתִיד לְמֵיתֵי, "to Jehovah belongs the sovereignty in this age and in that to come." Similarly it is said in the Psalter of Solomon, 17[3f.]: *τὸ κράτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*[4] *μετ' ἐλέου, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἐν κρίσει*, "the might of our God is (upon us)[4] for ever with mercy, and the sovereignty of our God is upon the peoples for ever in judgment."

Since God is in reality Ruler even now,—a fact which only requires to be openly recognised,—the establishment with power of His sovereignty may after all be termed an "appearing." Thus the Assumptio Mosis (10[1]) already says: "Parebit regnum illius (scil. Domini)." The Midrash on Cant. 2[12] represents the "sovereignty of God" as one day taking the place of the "ungodly sovereignty" (מַלְכוּת הָרִשְׁעָה),[5] and says of the former: הִגִּיעַ זְמַנָּהּ שֶׁל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם שֶׁתִּתְגַּלֶּה, "the time has arrived for the sovereignty of God to be revealed." The relation of God to Israel during this sovereignty is the subject of the petition, Sopher. xiv. 12: תִּתְגַּלֶּה וְתֵרָאֶה

[1] *Zunz*, loc. cit. 386; and for the text of the prayer, Machzor Vitry, 75; *Baer's* Seder Abodath Jisrael, 131.

[2] Seder Rab Amram, i. 9[a].

[3] Machzor Vitry, 343.

[4] *ἐφ ἡμᾶς*, "upon us," has obviously to be supplied.

[5] The Roman rule is here meant.

מַלְכוּתוֹ עָלֵינוּ, "may His sovereignty over us be made open and manifest!"

This mode of expression is specially popular with the Targum writers, who wish to avoid the thought that God in person should appear on earth. In place of הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, "behold your God," Isa. 40[9], the Targum says: אִתְגְּלִיאַת מַלְכוּתָא דֶאֱלָהֲכוֹן, "the sovereignty of your God has become manifest"; and in place of יְהוָה מָלָךְ, "Jehovah shall reign," Mic. 4[7] תִּתְגְּלֵי מַלְכוּתָא דַיְיָ, "the sovereignty of God will be manifest." Expressions of similar tenour occur in the Targum for the passages, Isa. 31[4] 52[7], Ezek. 7[7. 10] 11[24], Obad. [21], Zech. 14[9].

It cannot be ascertained that any idea of a pre-existence of the divine rule in heaven was contemplated in this connection. That which exists from the first is God as Ruler or Sovereign. The new element, which the future brings, belongs to the sphere of the earthly realisation of His sovereignty. There is here no thought of pre-existent "realities" emerging into the course of the world.[1] But while for the Jews the מַלְכוּת of God invariably means the governance exercised by Him, it is quite compatible with this idea that different terms had to be used when the blessings promised to Israel in the Messianic age were to be indicated.[2]

C. The Application of the Idea of the Divine Sovereignty in the Words of Jesus.

A preliminary analysis of the Jewish usage of the idea of the divine government had to be premised, in order that its specific application by Jesus might appear in the proper

[1] See also Fundamental Ideas, I. 6 f.; *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 189.

[2] *F. Krop*, La Pensée de Jésus sur le royaume de Dieu, 22, incorrectly holds that "the reaction against the Messianic hopes after the fall of Jerusalem" has contributed to this result. This reaction is just as little demonstrable as its alleged results. *Holtzmann*, loc. cit. i. 189, is also inaccurate in speaking of the "kingdom of heaven" as only another name for "the days of the Messiah."

light. This application may be studied to best advantage, in connection with the various composite expressions into which the idea in question enters, in the discourse of Jesus. We give them in six groups.

1. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IS THE SUBJECT OF AN ANNOUNCEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE VERBS *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, κηρύσσειν, διαγγέλλειν.*[1]

It cannot, however, be pronounced certain that Jesus ever directly coupled any one of these verbs with *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* (*τῶν οὐρανῶν*). Luke alone has on one occasion (4^{43}) ascribed to Jesus the words *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν β. τ. θ.* The parallel passage, Mark 1^{38}, has *κηρύσσειν* with no object. The passive *ἡ β. τ. θ. εὐαγγελίζεται* is likewise found only in Luke (16^{16}) with no parallel in Matt. 11^{12}, and, moreover, raises difficulties to the Semitic translator, the passive of בְּשַׂר meaning always "to receive a message," but not "to be announced."[2] Even the substantive *εὐαγγέλιον* is only once, Matt. 24^{14}, connected with *ἡ βασιλεία.* The parallel passage, Mark 13^{10}, omits *βασιλεία,* just as it is also omitted, Matt. 26^{13}, in connection with *εὐαγγέλιον.* In Mark 1^{15}, but not in the parallel, Matt. 4^{17}, Jesus speaks of "believing in the gospel," without further qualification. The formula *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ* (*ἕνεκεν*) *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* is so expressed only in Mark 8^{35} 10^{29}, whereas in Matt. 16^{25} (Luke 9^{24}) and Matt. 19^{29} (Luke 18^{29}) the gospel is not mentioned. It was within the Christian community that *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* and *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι,* with or without *ἡ β. τ. θ.,* first attained the position of a formula.

In the verb בְּשַׂר, which must be assumed to be the

[1] The association with *ὁμοιοῦν* and *ὅμοιος εἶναι* is not taken into consideration here, as being without weight for the idea of the *β. τ. θ.*

[2] In Matt. 11^{5} (Luke 7^{22}) *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται* corresponds accurately with the Aramaic מִסְכְּנִין מְתַבַּשְּׂרִין. Only בְּשׂוֹרָא מְבָא as complement can hardly be dispensed with.

original Aramaic expression, the idea of glad tidings is not so inherent as in the Greek *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*. Even in the Old Testament, 1 Sam. 4[17], בְּשַׂר is used of mournful tidings. The Aramaic בְּשׂוֹרְתָא is applied, Ber. R. 81, to the announcement of a death;[1] and a glad message, Meg. Taan. xii., Ech. R. i. 31, expressly adds the adjective בְּשׂוֹרְתָא טָבְתָא (cf. Ber. ix. 1, Hebr. בְּשׂוֹרוֹת טוֹבוֹת). Consequently בִּשֵּׂר will have to be translated by "announce"—even in such sentences as: יְהֵא מְבַשָּׂר[2] לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "may he receive the announcement promising the life of the age to come," j. Keth. 35[a]; יְהֵא מְבַשָּׂר שֶׁבֶּן הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא הוּא, "may he receive the announcement that he is a son of the age to come," j. Shek. 47[c] (Meïr, *c.* 180 A.D.); רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ מְבַשֶּׂרֶת וְאוֹמֶרֶת, "the Holy Spirit announces (in the Scripture) and says," b. Sot. 11[a], 46[a].

Closely related also is the phrase: מְבֻטָּח הוּא שֶׁהוּא בֶּן הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "he is assured that he is a son of the age to come," b. Keth. 111[a] (Yokhanan), or: הוּא מְבֻטָּח לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, Siphre Deut. 305, edition Friedm. 129[b]; compare also: אַבְטַחְתַּנִי לְמִחְסֶן עָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "thou hast assured me that I shall inherit the age to come," Targ. Ruth 2[13]; אַבְטְחָךְ לָךְ וְלַאֲבוּךְ לְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "he has assured thee of the age to come for thyself and for thy father," b. Sanh. 98[a]. The phraseology is important as the New Testament conception of the "promise" (*ἐπαγγελία*, *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι*) is to be derived from it. Compare, further, Jas. 2[5], where *ἡ βασιλεία* is the object of promise; 1 John 2[25], which makes *ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος* the content of the promise; and 1 Tim. 4[8] *ἐπαγγελία ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης*. To the same class belongs the sentence, which occurs several times, אֵין הַבְטָחָה לַצַּדִּיק בָּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, Ber. R. 76, "for the pious there is no assurance (promise) in this age"; and in the Apoc. of Baruch 53[3] "the promise of life hereafter" (Syr. מלכנא דחיי דמן בתר כן).

It thus appears that the sovereignty of God is the

[1] Targ. Lam. 1[1] puts the fuller form בְּשׂוֹרְתָא בִּישָׁא, "bad news."

[2] j. Kil. 32[b] has the erroneous reading מָחֵי.

content of a "message" or "tidings," and not without further qualification of "a message of glad tidings." With this distinction agrees the fact that its proclamation, according to Matt. 4^{17} (Mark 1^{15}), cf. Luke 24^{47}, should above all things lead to repentance.

The germs of this development may be seen in the Old Testament in such passages as Isa. 40^{9} 41^{27} 52^{7}. The Apocalypse of Baruch mentions the message of salvation, 46^{6}, 77^{12}. Subsequently Elijah ranks as the herald of salvation according to Targum Jerus. I. on Num. 25^{12}; Pesikta Rabbati, chap. 35 end; Midrash Vayyosha;[1] cf. *Justin*, Dial. c. Trypho, c. 8. To the Messiah Himself the same function is assigned in Schir. R. 2^{13}; Pes. Rabb. chap. 36; Trg. Ech. 2^{22}, by Eleazar ben Kalir in "Az milliphne bereschith."[2]

In Luke 9^{2} *κηρύσσειν τ. β. τ. θ.* is found as part of a mandate laid by Jesus upon His disciples. Mark 3^{14} has *κηρύσσειν* with no complement, while in Matt. 10^{7} (cf. Luke 10^{9}) the charge is thus expressed: *κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.* This last form of the charge commends itself as most natural on the lips of Jesus. Of this, *κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, Matt. 24^{14} (Mark 13^{10}), 26^{13} (Mark 14^{9}) should be regarded as an abbreviation. The shorter form points back to בַּשַּׂר בְּשׂוֹרָתָא, with which compare: בְּשׂוֹרָתָא טָבְתָא אִתְבַּשַּׂרְתְּ, "thou hast received good tidings," Ech. R. i. 31; and also in Samaritan הָדָא[3] בְּסַרְתָּה דַּאֲנָה מְכַּפַּר לָךְ, "this announcement which I declare to thee," Marka, Death of Moses, 26. Even where *εὐαγγέλιον* is not present, בַּשַּׂר would not be inadmissible for *κηρύσσειν*. Of course there is also available the Aphel form אַכְרִיז,[4] which corresponds still more closely to the Greek term, and is a verbal form derived

[1] *A. Jellinek*, Beth ha-Midrasch, i. 54; *D. Castelli*, Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei, 196, 201, cites also b. Erub. 43^{b}; b. Pes. 13^{a}; Deb. R. 3; but in these passages the announcement of salvation is not attributed to Elijah.

[2] See my treatise, "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias der Synagoge," 73.

[3] The same passage contains an undefined form בּיסרה (בְּסָרָה), which would lead us to expect בְּסָרְתָּא as the defined form.

[4] The Peal also seems to occur Koh. R. 7^{11}; Marka, Death of Moses, 12.

from the noun כָּרוֹז = *κήρυξ*. It is already used in Dan. 5[29], and is applied, *e.g.* j. Ber. 7[c], to an intimation which was to be proclaimed in the synagogue. קָרָא occurs, indeed, through the influence of the Hebrew, in the Targum in Lev. 25[10], Isa. 61[1], meaning "to proclaim"; but elsewhere in the Jewish-Aramaic literature קָרָא seems to be used only for "to summon, to name, to read."

διαγγέλλειν τὴν β. τ. θ. occurs in Luke 9[60], but is wanting in the parallel passage Matt. 8[22]. Doubtless it is merely a Greek variant for *κηρύσσειν*, so that a special Aramaic term corresponding to it is not a matter of necessity. If such a term were wanted, אוֹדַע, "to make known," might be proposed, as it can be cited in the sense required from the Book of Daniel, the letters of Gamaliel,[1] and j. Ber. 7[c]; j. Ned. 40[a]; Vay. R. 25.

There still calls for notice *λαλεῖν περὶ τῆς β. τ. θ.*, occurring in the narrative Luke 9[11], for which Mark 6[34] offers merely *διδάσκειν πολλά*. A phrase established by tradition is obviously not present in this instance. In Aramaic מַלֵּל בְּמַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא would be unusual, all the more as מַלֵּל, so common in the Targums, is elsewhere surprisingly rare. The only instances known to me for מַלֵּל are Ber. R. 32[47]; b. Sot. 35[a]; pass. אִתְמַלֵּל, j. Schek. 50[a].[2] In place of it אִשְׁתָּעִי, properly "to relate," is used in Vay. R. 34; b. Yom. 9[b]; b. Sot. 35[a]. One might rather expect to find תַּנִּי בְּ, "to instruct in," which likewise occurs in Vay. R. 34;[3] cf. Hebr. שָׁנָה, for religious instruction of every kind (*e.g.* Ab. d. R. Nathan, 18).

Peculiar difficulty attaches to the phrase now to be mentioned: *πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς (ἐν) τῇ βασιλείᾳ* (or *εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν*) *τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Matt. 13[52]. A verb, to which *μαθητεύειν* in the sense here represented would correspond, does not exist in the Jewish Aramaic (or in

[1] See "Aram. Dialektproben," 3.

[2] Even here the sense of מיין דמתמללין בעלמא is not properly intelligible.

[3] Vay. R. 34, תְּנָא, to learn, is found beside תַּנִּי, to teach. But תַּנִּי also means "to relate," j. Maas. Sh. 55[c].

Hebrew). One could only substitute: כָּל סָפְרָא דְּהוּא תַלְמִיד לְ(בְּ)מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא, "every scribe who is a disciple of the sovereignty of God." But probably the phrase is due to the author writing in Greek. In that case no precise equivalent in the words of Jesus need be sought for.

In regard to *ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλείας*, see above, p. 95. *τὰ μυστήρια τ. β. τ. ο.*, Matt. 13[11] (cf. Mark 4[11], Luke 8[10]), would be in Aramaic: רָזֵי מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא; cf. Apoc. of Bar. 81[4] "he made known to me the mystery of the times" (Syr. אודעני רזא דזבנא). Subsequently the Greek word also came to be used by the Jews of Galilee, מִלָּה דְמִסְטֵירִין, "mystery," Ber. R. 74. It is significant that according to Pes. Rabb. 14[b] the *Mishna* is the "secret counsel" (מִסְטֵירִין) of God proving the Jews to be the sons of God, and has been entrusted for guardianship to them and not to the Christians.

2. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IS REGARDED AS AN APPROACHING DISPENSATION, BEING THE SUBJECT OF THE VERBS *ἐγγίζειν, ἐγγὺς εἶναι, φθάνειν, ἔρχεσθαι, ἀναφαίνεσθαι.*

(*a*) *To be at hand, near* (*ἐγγίζειν, ἐγγὺς εἶναι*).

In addition to *ἤγγικεν* (*ἤγγικε*), Matt. 4[17] (Mark 1[15]) 10[7] (Luke 10[9]), Luke 10[11], there occurs also *ἐγγύς ἐστιν*, Luke 21[31], in which case, however, the parallels in Mark 13[29], Matt. 24[33], do not contain *β. τ. θ.* as subject. Both are capable of reproduction in Aramaic. *ἤγγικεν* would be קָרְבָא, or קְרֵבַת with or without לְמֵיתֵי; cf. Targ. Ech. 4[18] קְרֵב סוֹפָנָא, "our end is come near"; and Targ. Isa. 13[22] קָרִיב לְמֵיתֵי עִדָּן, "the time is at hand." For *ἐγγύς ἐστιν* reference can be made to Onk. Deut. 32[35] קָרִיב יוֹם; Jerus. I. קָרִיב הוּא יוֹמָא; Jerus. II. קָרִיב לְמֵיתֵי יוֹם; Targ. Isa. 56[1] קָרִיב פֻּרְקָנִי לְמֵיתֵי, "my redemption is nigh"; and Apoc. of Bar. 23[7] (Syriac version) קריב הו פורקני דנאתי. For the phrases under consideration, therefore, we may perhaps assume the original to have been קָרִיבָה מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא לְמֵיתֵי. This form of expres-

sion is more probable than the Aramaic מְטָא, to arrive, to which also it would be possible to revert. The Targums usually put this word for the Hebr. בּוֹא, when the latter is meant to express that a set time has arrived, *e.g.* Targ. Ezek. $7^{2.\,6.\,7.\,12}$; Amos 8^{2}; Jonah 2^{1}, and Cant. 7^{13} (in this מְטָא זִמַן פֻּרקָנָא, "the time of redemption has come").

(*b*) *To come* (*φθάνειν, ἔρχεσθαι*).

To מְטָא, just mentioned under (*a*), one must revert for the original of *ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, Matt. 12^{28} (Luke 11^{20}). In Dan. 4^{21} עַל מְטָא means "to come upon any one" in such a way that he cannot escape, Theod. *ἔφθασεν ἐπί τινα*. This, too, can be united with לְמֵיתֵי, Targ. Ezek. 7^{2}: מְטָת פּוּרעָנוּת קָצָא לְמֵיתֵי עַל, "the judgment of the end has arrived [that was] to come upon," etc.

ἔρχεσθαι is predicated of the divine "sovereignty" in the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6^{10} (Luke 11^{2}); also Luke 17^{20} 22^{18} (the parallels, Matt. 26^{29}, Mark 14^{25}, are differently expressed), Mark 9^{1} (differently Matt. 16^{28}, Luke 9^{27}). With this may be compared Bar. Apoc. 44^{12} "there cometh . . . the new age" (Syr. עלמא חדתא . . . אתא); Targ. Mic. 4^{8}, לָךְ עֲתִידָא כַּלכוּתָא לְמֵיתֵי, "to thee shall the kingly sovereignty come"; and Mark 11^{10} *εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυείδ*.

(*c*) *To appear* (*ἀναφαίνεσθαι*).

The term *ἀναφαίνεσθαι*, represented solely by Luke as narrator (Luke 19^{11}), is the expression used by preference in connection with מַלכוּתָא דֵּיי throughout the Targums (see above, p. 100 f.). It also meets us in Assump. Mos. 10^{1}, and Apoc. of Baruch 39^{7} (in this case applied to the sovereignty of the Messiah).[1] As a parallel to the sentence given on p. 100 from the Midrash on Canticles,

[1] Syr. תתגלא רישיתה דמשיחי, "the sovereignty of mine anointed will be made manifest."

there may be cited the saying from the Hagada on Canticles vi. 10:[1] "As the circuit of sun and moon is accomplished in view of all, so shall the sovereignty of the Messiah, when it appears, be revealed openly to the world (כְּשֶׁתְּנַלֶּה כַּלְכוּת הַמָּשִׁיחַ תִּגָּלֶה בְּפַרְהֶסְיָא לָעוֹלָם). The rare occurrence of the expression on the lips of Jesus shows, at least, that it was not commonly used by Him.

On the term *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν*, Luke 17[21], see at the end of No. I.

3. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IS LIKEWISE REGARDED AS AN APPROACHING DISPENSATION, BEING THE OBJECT OF THE VERBS *ἰδεῖν* AND *προσδέχεσθαι*.

(*a*) *To see* (*ἰδεῖν*).

In Luke 9[27] Jesus speaks of a "seeing" of the sovereignty of God. In Mark 9[1] it is said that men should see the sovereignty of God coming with power. The former is not a mere synonym for the latter; for "to see the sovereignty of God" means "to survive to be a participator in it," just as רָאָה לְעָתִיד לָבוֹא, j. Sanh. 29[c] (Baraitha), means "to live on into the age to come as a partaker in it." See also the phrase adduced below: רָאָה בְּנֶחָמָה, "to see the consolation." The meaning is not quite the same in Targ. Isa. 53[10] יֶחֱזוּן בְּמַלְכוּת מְשִׁיחֲהוֹן, "they, the forgiven Israelites, will see the sovereignty of their Messiah"; nor in the sentence from an ancient Kedushah of the morning prayer on the Sabbath:[2] עֵינֵינוּ תִרְאֶינָה בְמַלְכוּתֶךָ, "may our eyes see Thy (God's) royal sovereignty." In these cases, then, the thought is not of a special participation in the sovereignty that is to appear. Of a mere vision of the future mention is also made in Bar. Apoc. 51[8] "They will see the age which is now invisible to them, yea, see the

[1] Jew. Qu. Review, vii. (1895) 157.
[2] Seder Rab Amram, i. 10[b].

time which is now hidden from them" (Syr. חזין גר הו עלמא דלא מתחזא להון השא ונחזון לזבנא דהשא כסא מנהון).

(*b*) *To expect, look for* (*προσδέχεσθαι*).

According to the Gospel narrative, Mark 15[43] (Luke 23[51]), the sovereignty of God is being "looked for" (*προσδέχεσθαι*), just as the consolation of Israel or the redemption of Jerusalem was "looked for," according to Luke 2[25. 38]. The Aramaic word for this is סְבַר, Onk. Gen. 49[18]; Targ. Isa. 30[18] 64[3]; Hab. 2[3]; cf. the form שְׁבַר, which has made its way into late parts of the Old Testament, LXX Dan. 7[25] *προσδέξεται* for Aramaic סבר, as also the substantive סְבָרָא, "expectation," Ber. R. 53. The Pael סַבֵּי occurs both in the Jerus. Targums to the Pentateuch and in the Evang. Hieros. for "to look for, expect."[1] I cannot, however, verify either this or even סַבַּר in the Jewish-Galilean literature.[2]

Note.—The expression "to look for the consolation of Israel" has its parallels in Bar. Apoc. 44[7] "Ye will see the consolation of Zion" (Syr. תחזון בבויאה דצהיון), and in the Targumic מְחַפְּדִין לִשְׁנֵי נֶחָמְתָא, "they who long for the years of the consolations," Targ. 2 Sam. 23[4], Jer. 31[6]. In these instances, according to Targ. 2 Sam. 23[1] יוֹמֵי נֶחָמְתָא, "the days of the consolations," are identical with סוֹף עָלְמָא, "the end of the age." A formula of asseveration put into the mouth of Simeon ben Shetach in b. Shebu. 34[a] as early as 100 B.C., which is also used by Eleazar ben Zadok,[3] j. Keth. 35[c] (*c.* 100 A.D.), is thus expressed: אֶרְאֶה בַּנֶּחָמָה, "I shall see the consolation!" and a Baraitha b. Taan. 11[a] pronounces the following verdict against any one who in time of distress separates himself from the community: אַל יִרְאֶה בְּנֶחָמַת הַצִּבּוּר, "let him not see the consolation of the com-

[1] Late Hebr. צִפָּה, "to hope for," may be mentioned at the same time.

[2] סְבֵי בִּי, Vay. R. 34, does not mean "hope in me," but from אִסְתַּכַּל בִּי in apposition—it is equal to "look upon me!"

[3] See *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 52.

munity!" See also the Targ. Isa. 4^3 יְחֵוֵי בְנֶחָמַת יְרוּשְׁלֶם "he shall see the consolation of Jerusalem"; and 33^{20} עֵינָךְ יְחֵוֵין בְּנֶחָמַת יְרוּשְׁלֶם, "thine eyes shall see the consolation of Jerusalem." "Consolation" is, throughout these instances, not the resurrection, but redemption in its full extent.

4. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IS AN ORDER OF THINGS UNDER WHICH MEN ARE PLACED.

(*a*) *To sit at table, to eat bread* (*ἀνακλίνεσθαι, ἄρτον φαγεῖν*).

The patriarchs and all the prophets can be "seen" as subjects of the sovereignty of God, Luke 13^{28}. The context of the passage, as well as the parallel, Matt. 8^{11}, shows, however, that we have not here to do with a current expression. Currency may rather be assumed of the "reclining at table" (*ἀνακλίνεσθαι*), in the sovereignty of God, Matt. 8^{11} (Luke 13^{29}); cf. *ἀνάκεισθαι* in the parable of the Wedding Feast, Matt. $22^{10.\ 11}$, and the eulogy of one that sat at meat with Jesus (Luke 14^{15}): *μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ β. τ. θ.* As to drinking in the sovereignty of God, it is mentioned by Jesus, Matt. 26^{29} (Mark 14^{25}, Luke 22^{18}), in connection with the consummation of the passover there, Luke $22^{15.\ 16}$.

That there should be feasting in the Messianic age is implied rather than asserted by the ancient stories of Leviathan and Behemoth, which creatures were one day to serve as food for the pious. The first mention of this is in an ancient portion of the Apocalypse of Baruch (29^4); afterwards it occurs in the Book of Enoch $60^{7-9.\ 24}$, and in 2 Esd. 6^{49-52}. It is something quite different when, as in the case of Jesus, the time of salvation is merely *likened* to a feast. Dropping the figure, such a comparison only implies that the Messianic age brings joy and gratification. Thus the Slavonic Enoch (42^5)[1] says that the angels will

[1] Edition by *Morfill* and *Charles*, Oxford, 1896.

bring in Adam and the patriarchs to Paradise, "as one invites those with whom one loves to celebrate the festivals," and that these will then "with joy await his feast, in pleasure and untold abundance in the rapture and bliss of the light and in the life that never ends." About 120 A.D. Akiba speaks of a "repast" (סְעוּדָה) with which the present age concludes, Ab. iii. 16; and Jacob likens the age to come to a banqueting-hall (טְרַקְלִין), into which one enters from the vestibule (פְּרוֹזְדוֹר) of the current age (Ab. iv. 16), a simile which is repeated in Tosephta Ber. vii. 21. Only from a later period do we find traces of an actual repast which God prepared for the pious—"the feast of Paradise" (הַסְּעוּדָה שֶׁל גַּן עֵדֶן).[1] Then the fable of Behemoth and Leviathan is also combined therewith. Detailed descriptions of this feast are given in *Jellinek's* Beth ha-Midrasch iii. 76, v. 45 f., vi. 150 ff. Noteworthy is the passage in the Book of Elijah (loc. cit. iii. 67):[2] אֲנִי רֹאֶה אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב וְכָל הַצַּדִּיקִים יוֹשְׁבִים, "I see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the righteous sitting"; and Targ. Eccl. 9^7, where God says to each of the pious: אֱזֵיל טְעוֹם בְּחֶדְוָא לַחְמָךְ וּשְׁתִי בְּלֵב טָב חַמְרָא דְּאִצְטְנַע לָךְ בְּגִנַּן עֵדֶן, "come, eat thy bread with joy, and drink with a merry heart the wine which is reserved for thee in Paradise." See also Targ. Ruth 2^{12} לֶהֱוֵי חֶלְקָךְ עִם שָׂרָה וְרִבְקָה וְרָחֵל וְלֵאָה, "that thy portion may be with Sarah and Rebekah, and Rachel and Leah."

From the Gospels it may be inferred that the conception of an actual repast for the pious was already an old-established idea. Even for Jesus this repast was no mere figure of speech. But He speaks of it in plain language only for the purpose of emphasising the fellowship which the righteous of all ages are destined to enjoy. Never did He refer to the repast merely as a repast. Even in the "satisfaction"

[1] Schem. R. 45 (*Assi*); see also *Hamburger*, Real-Encyc. f. Bibel u. Talm. ii. 1312 ff.

[2] See also *M. Buttenwieser*, Die hebr. Elias-Apokalypse (1897), 25, 66.

through the sovereignty of God spoken of in Matt. 5^{6} (Luke 6^{21}) there is no idea of a repast. It is rather meant to express figuratively, like Isa. $65^{13f.}$, the complete contentment of those who are for the present suffering want.

The determination of the Aramaic expressions to be used here is not without difficulty. Late Hebrew has הֵסֵב [1] for to "recline at table." To this corresponds in the Targums אַסְחַר; see, *e.g.*, Onk. Gen. 37^{25} וְאִסְתַּחֲרוּ לְמֵיכַל לַחְמָא, "and they lay down to eat bread." Both verbs in themselves mean merely "to form a circle round a table." In the Galilean dialect of the Palestinian Talmud (Ber. 12^{b}; Taan. 66^{a}), and in the Palestinian-Christian dialect, the usual word for this was, at a later date, רְבַע, "to lie down."

For "to eat," אֵכַל is a term common to all Aramaic dialects. "To take food, take a meal," could be rendered by סְעַד, although the Gal. and the Pal.-Chr. dialects use נְגַם. "To eat bread" for the simple "to eat" occurs in the Old Testament, and hence also in the Targums, pretty frequently, Gen. 37^{25}, Ex. 2^{20}, 2 Sam. 9^{7}; in the Gospels, Matt. 15^{2}, Mark 3^{20} $7^{2.5}$, Luke $14^{1.2}$ In the later Jewish literature I find but few examples. In b. Ber. 42^{b} a summons to eat is expressed: נֵיכוֹל לַחְמָא, "let us eat bread"; and b. Bab. mez. 86^{b}, the Palestinian Tankhum bar Khanilay, speaking of Moses, says that he did not "eat bread" on Sinai, while the angels, when visiting Abraham, "ate bread." It is self-evident that the Babylonian popular expression כְּרַךְ רִיפְתָּא (properly "to roll bread") for "to eat" is unsuitable. In Ber. R. 82 a saying of Joshua [3] (*c.* 100 A.D.) is given to the effect that the righteous man will be satisfied "with the bread of the age to come" (מִלַּחְמוֹ שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם הַבָּא). But the mention of the bread is here due to Prov. 28^{19}, and does not therefore imply a prevalent idiom. On the other hand

[1] Similarly, as early as Cant. 1^{12} מֶסֶב, "dinner-party."
[2] Cf. *Joh. Vorstius*, De Hebraismis Novi Testamenti, ii. 255 ff.
[3] See *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 190.

must be cited the ancient phrase עָבַד לְחֵם, "to prepare a meal," Dan. 5[1], Hebr.: עָשָׂה לֶחֶם, Eccles. 10[19], which the later Rabbinical literature does not use, in the same sense at least. The benediction given to him who should "eat bread" in the theocracy would be thus rendered in Aramaic: טוּבוֹהִי דְּאֵכֵיל לַחְמָא בְּמַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא. It is striking in this case that the term "theocracy" should here be used by another in the sense regularly given to it by Jesus, although the discourse of Jesus did not furnish a direct occasion for this use. Some expression, more common among the Jews, perhaps בְּעָלְמָא דְאָתֵי, "in the age to come," might here be substituted.

(*b*) *To be greatest, least* (*ὁ μικρότερος, ἐλάχιστος, μείζων, μέγας*).

The righteous shine forth as the sun in the theocracy, Matt. 13[43] conformably with Dan. 12[3]. As, however, in Dan. 12[3] the stars are also introduced into the comparison, the idea developed by Paul,[1] and by Yehuda i.,[2] is not excluded, that the lustre is of different kinds, and that, therefore, degrees of rank are to be found among the righteous. One may in the theocracy be *ὁ μικρότερος*, Matt. 11[11] (Luke 7[28]), or *ἐλάχιστος*, Matt. 5[19], *i.e.* "the least," but also "the greatest" (*ὁ μείζων*), Matt. 18[1] (where, however, the parallels, Mark 9[34], Luke 9[46], speak only of the greatest among the disciples of Jesus), or "great" (*μέγας*), Matt. 5[19].

This gradation recalls the statement of Joshua ben Levy (*c.* 250), that there are men who are "esteemed" (יְקָרִים) in this present age, but who will be despised (קְפוּיִים, properly, "floating on the surface")[3] in the age to come; and another of his son Joseph, who on his deathbed had a vision of a "world turned upside down" (עוֹלָם הָפוּךְ), in which the "highest found themselves lowest, and the lowest highest" (עֶלְיוֹנִים לְמַטָּה וְתַחְתּוֹנִים לְמַעְלָה), which, however, was not to apply in the case of his own father.[4] Simeon ben Azzay (*c.* 110)

[1] 1 Cor. 15[41]. [2] See farther on. [3] b. Pes. 50[a].
[4] Loc. cit. and b. Bab. b. 10[b]; see *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Amoräer, i. 187, ii. 105.

said:[1] "He who, for the sake of the Tora, renders himself even a simpleton, will in the end be exalted." Yirmeya[2] also taught on similar lines in a later period: "He who humbles himself in this age for the sake of the word of the law, will be made great in the future age." According to Yonathan ben Eleazar (*c.* 240 A.D.),[3] all are aware that in the age to come there will be great and small, only in the present age it is not known who is in reality great, and who is small. An Aramaic narrative[4] tells of a woman who is afraid that the acceptance in this age of a heavenly gift prejudices the status in the other world, and she therefore causes the gift to be returned. The principle:[5] כָּל צַדִּיק וְצַדִּיק יֵשׁ לוֹ עוֹלָם בִּפְנֵי עַצְמוֹ, "each righteous one (after death) has his own world for himself," ranked as a truth generally recognised. With this Yehuda i. (*c.* 200) is in accord when he explains (Siphre to Deut. 11^{21}, ed. Friedmann, 83^{a}), that the righteous will in the future have different grades, envying one another no more than the stars in spite of their different brilliance. A specially elevated third class of the pious is the subject of remark j. Chag. 77^{a}. The Palestinian Talmud (in the same passage) holds that there will be seven such classes, an opinion supported elsewhere.[6]

In a similar way Jesus entertained the idea of different grades among those who had part in the theocracy. But the principle on which these ranks are assigned is not that of the Rabbis.

As Aramaic has no superlative, there is at our disposal for "the least," "the greatest," only זְעֵירָא, רַבָּא. Between ὁ *μείζων*, Matt. 18^{1}, and *μέγας*, Matt. 5^{19}, the only difference would be that in the former case רַבָּא, in the latter רַב, should

[1] Ber. R. 81; b. Ber. 63^{b}; see *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 416.
[2] b. Bab. m. 85^{b}.
[3] Pesikta Rabb., ed. Friedmann, 198^{b}; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. der pal. Am. i. 87.
[4] Ruth R. iii. 1; cf. Schem. R. 52. [5] Vay. R. 18; cf. Ruth R. iii. 1.
[6] Siphre, ed. Friedm. 67^{a}; Vay. R. 30; Midr. Ps. 16^{12}; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 19, 44.

be presupposed. With the expression may be compared: רביתא, read רַבְּתָה, זְעֵירְתָא, "a great thing," "a small thing," j. Keth. 29c, and רַבָּה הֲוָה בֵּינֵיהוֹן, "the greatest of them," Ber. R. 38.

(*c*) *The sons of the theocracy* (*οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας*).

The expression peculiar to Matthew: *οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας*, Matt. 8^{12} 13^{38}, still calls for mention here. On the omission of *τῶν οὐρανῶν* see above, p. 95 f. The son as such is he who belongs to the father's house by being born of his spouse. But the idea that the son, in contrast to the slaves, is the father's legitimate successor, in short, the heir, is so habitual in antiquity that the thought of the son almost immediately involves that of the heir, cf. Matt. 21^{38} (Mark 12^{7}, Luke 20^{14}), Rom. 8^{17}, Gal. 4^{7}. The "sons of the theocracy" are thus those who belong to it in virtue of their birth, who thereby have a natural right to the possession of it. This is the sense in which the "sons of the theocracy" are spoken of in Matt. 8^{12}, who are cast forth from its sphere.—In Matt. 13^{38}, on the other hand, the *υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας* are set side by side with the *υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. In this case the "sons" are those who have in themselves the nature of the father. The sons of the theocracy are thus the men of a cognate disposition with it, the "righteous" (*δίκαιοι*); cf. v.[43]. Of the same character are the expressions: *οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν* (*τῶν Φαρισαίων*), Matt. 12^{27} (Luke 11^{19}); *υἱοὶ τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας*, Matt. 23^{31}; *υἱὲ διαβόλου*, Acts 13^{10}; בֶּן הַמְרַצֵּחַ הַזֶּה, "this son of a murderer," 2 Kings 6^{32}; קַנָּאי, קַנָּאי בַּר קַנָּאי, "zealot, son of a zealot," Vay. R. 33; בַּר פַּחִין, "son of obscure parents," j. Sanh. 30c. The first-named idiom is recalled by the comparatively frequent expression: בַּר עָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "a son of the age to come," b. Taan. 22a; in Hebr. בֶּן הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, b. Pes. 8a; b. Bab. b. 10b; j. Shek. 47c; בְּנֵי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, j. Ber. 13d; בְּנֵי הָעֲלִיָּה, "the sons of the upper room" (the heavenly world), b. Sukk. 45b. Such is the

designation of one who has an assured claim to the future age.—On the other hand, the בְּנֵי מַלְכוּתָא, Targ. Eccl. 5^8, are the citizens of a realm already in existence; בְּנֵי קִרְתָּא, j. Taan. 66^c, the inhabitants of a city; בְּנֵי הַחֻפָּה, j. Sukk. 53^a, the guests at a wedding; cf. *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*, Matt. 9^{15}; *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, Luke 16^8.

5. THE THEOCRACY IS AN ORDER OF THINGS TO WHICH MEN ATTAIN, FROM WHICH ALSO IT IS POSSIBLE TO BE EXCLUDED.

(*a*) *To attain to, enter into* (*εἰσέρχεσθαι, εἰσπορεύεσθαι*).

One can "attain to" (*εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς*) the theocracy according to Matt. 5^{20} 7^{21} 18^3 $19^{23f.}$ (Mark $10^{23ff.}$, Luke 18^{24} *εἰσπορεύεσθαι*, ^{25}), 23^{13}; cf. Luke 11^{52}, Mark 9^{47} 10^{15} (Luke 18^{17}). It is the same meaning that appears in the attaining "unto life" (*εἰς τὴν ζωήν*), Matt. 18^8 (Mark $9^{43.45}$) ^{9} 19^{17}, and in the parable "unto the joy of the Lord" (*εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου*), Matt. $25^{21.23}$, and also "through the narrow gate" (*διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης*), Matt. 7^{13} (Luke 13^{24}). The "attaining to His glory," which Jesus, Luke 24^{26}, announces in regard to Himself, is cognate. One can also be "not far" (*οὐ μακράν*) from the theocracy, Mark 12^{34}. The phrase: *βιάζεσθαι εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ.*, Luke 16^6, will receive separate consideration below.

εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ. has its Jewish parallel in אֲתָא לְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "to attain to the age to come," b. Chag. 15^b; b. Sanh. 98^a, 105^a; Hebr. בּוֹא לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, b. Sanh. 110^b (Baraitha); Tos. Sanh. xiii. 1 (Joshua ben Khananya, *c.* 120); בּוֹא לָעֲתִיד לָבוֹא, j. Sanh. 29^c; cf. the causative אַיְתִי לְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "to bring into the age to come," b. Taan. 29^a; Hebr. הֵבִיא לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא (Eleazar ben Azarya, *c.* 110 A.D.), Siphre, ed. Friedm. 73^b.[1] Quite unusual is the phrase: עַל לְחַיֵּי עָלְמָא, "to enter

[1] See *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 221. Bab. mez. ii. 11 has לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא.

into the life eternal," Targ. Ps. 40[8].[1] Hence the rendering "to attain to" corresponds more closely to the original (Aramaic) than "to enter into."

There is one instance to which this does not apply: *εἰσέλθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης*, Matt. 7[13] (cf. Luke 13[24]). For this, recourse must be had to עַל, "to enter into." The appeal therefore runs: עֲלִי[2] בְּחַרְעָא עָקָא, with which compare עָלִין בְּחַד תְּרַע, "entering in through one door," j. Sabb. 17[b]; and עַאל בְּהָדָא נָקְבָא, "he slipped through that hole," Koh. R. 5[14].

The idea that one attains to the life to come through sufferings and self-sacrifice is not unfamiliar to the Jews. The Second Book of Esdras speaks (7[13ff.]) of the difficulty of attaining to the future life, and compares it (in v.[7]) to the narrow road leading, between fire and water, to a city stored with good things. According to Vay. R. 30 (cf. Pes. 179[b]), King David addresses to God these words: "Show to me what gate may be wide open into the life of the age to come" (אֵיזֶה פִּילוֹן מְפֻלָּשׁ לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא). The divine reply, according to Azarya, is: "If thou art in need of life thou art in need of afflictions" (אִם חַיִּים אַתָּה צָרִיךְ יְסוּרִין אַתָּה צָרִיךְ).

On "attaining to life," see also No. III.

As for attaining to "the joy of the Lord" (*εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου*), Matt. 25[21. 23], it has to be observed that the Hebrew שִׂמְחָה, "joy," is also used specially for "the joy connected with a festival." This sense is already present in late books of the Old Testament, 2 Chron. 30[23], Neh. 12[27]. In Sukk. v.[1] שִׂמְחַת בֵּית הַשּׁוֹאֵבָה is the title of a special festivity during the feast of Tabernacles. "To come to the wedding-feast" is expressed in Tob. 9[2] HL[3] by בּוֹא בְּשִׂמְחָה. It is prescribed, j. Mo. k. 80[d], that one should not intermix

[1] "To come into," moreover, is also generally expressed by לְ עַל, s. j. Pea 21[a]; Vay. R. 37; less frequently בְּ עַל, j. Sanh. 21[b]; and גּוֹ עַל, j. Taan. 66[c]. Even "to fall into" is לְ נָפַל, j. Maaser. 52[a].

[2] Galil. עֲלֵי.

[3] By these letters (HL) M. Gaster designates the Hebrew recension of the Book of Tobit, published by him; see *M. Gaster*, Two unknown Hebrew versions of Tobit, London, 1897.

one שִׂמְחָה with another שִׂמְחָה, and therefore no marriage should be appointed to take place on a feast day. In Deb. R. 9 a father says: "I will lift up wine in honour of my son's wedding" (לְשִׂמְחָתוֹ שֶׁל בְּנִי). The Aramaic reproduction of the same statement, Koh. R. 3^2, has instead לְמִשְׁתְּיֵתֵיהּ, "for his banquet." This use of מִשְׁתְּיָתָא for "wedding-banquet" illustrates how it happens that in Matt. 22^2 Jesus can speak of a "wedding-feast" (*γάμοι*), while Luke 14^{16} recognises only a "great supper" (*δεῖπνον μέγα*). Still in Luke 12^{36} 14^8 the word *γάμοι* implies any form of entertainment. In any case it was not from his own wedding-feast that the Master came home (Luke 12^{36}), but from that of another person. שִׂמְחָתְךָ is in Vay. R. 28, "thy wedding," and just in the same way the corresponding Aramaic word הֲדוּתָא is used for "wedding," b. Gitt. 68^b. See also Pesikt. 193^a: מֶלֶךְ שֶׁבָּאַת לוֹ שִׂמְחָה, "a king to whom there came a festival." Whence it appears that עוֹל לְחֲדוֹת מָרָךְ would certainly have been understood by the hearers to signify, "enter thou into the festival of thy Lord."

(b) To invite (καλεῖν).

Not without "being bidden" does one enter to the banquet in the theocracy. In 1 Thess. 2^{12} Paul has the expression: *τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν*, which shows affinity with the "invitation" in the parable of the Supper, Matt. $22^{3f.\ 8f.\ 14}$ (Luke $14^{16f.\ 24}$). Jewish literature affords similar examples. The Galilean Amora Yokhanan (*c.* 260 A.D.) affirms, b. Bab. b. 75^b, that only "those who are invited" (מְזֻמָּנִים) go up to the "Jerusalem of the age to come" (יְרוּשָׁלַיִם שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם הַבָּא). Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 260 A.D.) declares, Midr. Tehill. 14^7, that Jacob rejoices above all the patriarchs in the coming of the period of "joy" for Israel, "because he is called to the banquet" (לְפִי שֶׁהוּא מְזֻמָּן לַסְּעוּדָה), conformably with Isa. 48^{12} (יִשְׂרָאֵל מְקֹרָאִי). The same expression is somewhat differently

applied, b. Ab. zar. 17[a], where a heavenly voice says of the penitent Eleazar ben Durdaya that he is "destined for the life of the age to come," מְזֻמָּן לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא. This expression is also attributed to a voice from heaven in regard to another person, b. Taan. 29[a]. This use agrees, however, with Acts 13[48] *τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.*

For "to invite" the Targum of Onkelos, influenced by the Hebrew, has always קְרָא; see Gen. 31[54], Ex. 34[15], Num. 25[2]; the Targum on the prophets, *e.g.* 1 Sam. 9[24], has זַמֵּן (זְמִן), just as in late Hebrew (see above, and Sabb. 153[a]). The invited person is זְמִינָא, Targ. 1 Sam. 9[13], 1 Kings 1[41]. Still the Hebr. קָרָא does occur Koh. R. 7[8]; and צְוַח, which is the equivalent of the Hebr. קָרָא, in the Galilean dialect, is found Vay. R. 28, while the Jerus. gospel uses only קָרָא. Hence Matt. 22[14] *πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί,* could be expressed in Aramaic by סַגִּיאִין זְמִינִין זְעִירִין בְּחִירִין.

(*c*) *To be fitted for, to be worthy of* (*εὔθετος εἶναι, καταξιωθῆναι*).

One must, moreover, be *worthy* of entrance into the theocracy. In Luke 9[62] Jesus uses the words: "he who is not fit for the theocracy" (*εὔθετός ἐστιν τῇ β. τ. θ.*, or *εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ.*; cf. Luke 14[35] *εἰς κοπρίαν εὔθετον*). In Luke alone (20[35]) is also found the expression: *καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν*; cf. Acts 13[46] *ἀξίους τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς*, and 2 Thess. 1[5] *καταξιωθῆναι τῆς β. τ. θ.* "To be worthy of the age to come" is a common expression with the Rabbis; see Aram. זָכָא לְעָלְמָא דְאָתֵי, b. Erub. 54[b]; b. Gitt. 68[b]; זָכָא וּשְׂבַע מִן—לְעָלְמָא דְאָתֵי, "to be worthy of being satisfied with—in the age to come," j. Taan. 66[c]; Hebr. זָכָה לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, b. Bab. b. 10[b]; זָכָה וְנֶהֱנֶה שְׁנֵי עוֹלָמִים, "to be worthy of inheriting two worlds," b. Ber. 51[a]; זוֹכֶה לֵירֵשׁ הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה וְהָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "he is worthy of possessing this age, and that which is to come," j. Ber. 11[c]; זָכָה לַמְּלוּכוּת, "he was worthy to become king," j. Ber. 4[c]. This זָכָא corresponds without doubt

to *καταξιωθῆναι*, including within itself also the idea of *τυχεῖν*. For *εὔθετος* recourse may be had to כָּשֵׁר;[1] cf. Onk. Ex. 4[13] מַן דְּכָשֵׁר לְמִשְׁלַח, "he who is fit to be sent"; Ber. R. 9: כָּל מִי שֶׁהוּא מִתְכַּשֵּׁר בְּמְלֶאכֶת הַפַּרְדֵּס יִכָּנֵס לָאוֹצָר, "every (worker) who proves himself fit in the work of the garden has access to the storehouse"; also Targ. Lam. 1[6]. כָּשֵׁר is preferable to חָזֵי (Galil. חֲמֵי) as used in Targs. Jerus. I. and II. Ex. 4[13] מַן דְּחָמֵי לְמִשְׁתַּלְחָה; for this חָזֵי, like its late-Hebrew parallel רָאוּי, is meant to be a passive participle, and should be pronounced[2] accordingly, though earlier it does have the sense "worthy." The phrase: בֶּן רָאוּי לַמַּלְכוּת, Bem. R. 9[24], means "a son who is worthy to be king." See also Onk. Gen. 49[3] לָךְ הֲוָה חֲזֵי לְמִפַּב, "thou wast worthy (it beseemed thee) to take"; cf. Jerus. I. Gen. 22[1], and j. Bab. b. 16[d] לֵית חֲמֵי לֵיהּ מַפָּקָה, "it did not beseem him to drive out." חָזֵי (חֲמֵי) might, indeed, be expressed in Greek by *ἄξιος*, and thus be preferably used in reproducing *ἄξιοι τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς*, Acts 13[46], though here also זָכֵא could be proposed; see Deb. R. 1: זוֹכֶה לְחַיִּים, "he has a claim upon the life (to come)." The Christian Palestinian uses for *ἄξιος* שׁוי, which means literally "similar to," "corresponding." The same root is already used in biblical Hebrew for "deserving," *e.g.* Esth. 7[4]; also in Neo-Hebraic, and, further, in Aramaic, Onk. Gen. 23[15]; Vay. R. 9; Targ. Esth. ii. 2. 1. But the sense of "equal," "equivalent," is too conspicuous to permit its being substituted in every case where *ἄξιος* may occur; see the dictum of Yannai (*c.* 230 A.D.):[3] הַשָּׁוִים אָרְחֵיהּ שַׁגִּי שָׁוִי, "he who appraises his way is of great worth."

[1] In the Galilean dialect I can verify כָּשֵׁר only in the sense "honest," j. Ab. z. 39[b], where כָּשֵׁר is the contrary of לֵיצָן, "scoffer"; and j. Taan. 65[b], where כַּשִּׁירָא is found by the side of חַצִּיפָא, "insolent."

[2] The superlinear pointing has frequently, by mistake, חֲזֵי, חֲמֵי; see my "Aram.-Neuhebr. Wörterbuch" under חֲזָא, חֲמָא.

[3] Vay. R. 9; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. i. 38.

(*d*) *To close against, to cast forth from, to go out* (κλείειν, ἐκβάλλειν, ἐξέρχεσθαι).

Jesus speaks of the Pharisees "closing" (κλείειν) the theocracy against men, Matt. 23[13]; of the "keys" (κλεῖδες) thereof, Matt. 16[19]; of "closing the door of the marriage chamber," Matt. 25[10] (Luke 13[25]); of "casting forth" (ἐκβάλλειν) from this chamber, Matt. 22[13]; Luke 13[28]; cf. Matt. 13[42. 50] 25[30]; of "being expelled" (ἐξέρχεσθαι) from the theocracy, Matt. 8[12].

Similar ideas are reported from Eleazar ben Zadok (*c.* 100 A.D.). He declares that the life of him who has misused the law will be eradicated from the present and the future world (נֶעֱקָרוּ חַיָּיו מִן הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה וּמִן הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא);[1] and with regard to the godless, he teaches that in the present world God accumulates good fortune upon them, "in order afterwards to cast them forth, and to compel them to take the lowest position" (לְטָרְדָן וּלְהוֹרִישָׁן לַמַּדְרֵיגָה הַתַּחְתּוֹנָה).[2] See also the expressions: טָרַד מִן הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "to reject from the future world," b. Bab. b. 15[b]; אִטְרִיד מֵהָהוּא עָלְמָא, "to be rejected from the other world," b. Chag. 15[a]. "To close against" in the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel, and of the Targ. of Onkelos, would be אֲחַר; in the dialect of the Targ. to the prophets אֲנִיף (this also in the Hebrew of Nehemiah, and in the Mishna), in Galilean טָרַד. For "casting forth," טָרַד alone comes into question; "to be expelled from" is נְפַק.

On "the keys" of the theocracy, see No. VIII. 6.

6. THE THEOCRACY IS A GOOD WHICH ADMITS OF BEING STRIVEN FOR, OF BEING BESTOWED, OF BEING POSSESSED, AND OF BEING ACCEPTED.

(*a*) *To strive for, seek, ask* (ζητεῖν, αἰτεῖν).

Instead of being anxious about food and raiment, one ought "to seek earnestly after the theocracy" (ζητεῖν τὴν

[1] Siphre, ed. Friedm. 84[b]; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 52. [2] b. Kidd. 40[b].

βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, scil. *τοῦ πατρός*), Luke 12[31] (Matt. 6[33], where *καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην* is added). In the same category are also the injunction "to seek" (*ζητεῖν*) that one may "find," Matt. 7[7f.] (Luke 11[9f.]), and the parable of the Merchant "seeking" goodly Pearls, and "finding" one of great price (Matt. 13[45f.]).

For *ζητεῖν* in the two meanings, to "strive for" (something desirable) and to "search for" (something that is hidden), the corresponding Aramaic word is בְּעָא. This means to "strive for, covet eagerly," Dan. 6[5]; Onk. Num. 16[10] (where the office of high priest is the object of the desire), and also "to seek," Onk. Gen. 37[16]; Targ. 1 Sam. 10[2]; Koh. R. 7[11] (where the passive אִתְבְּעִי means "to be sought for").

The same verb (בְּעָא) is also in use for "to ask"; see Dan. 6[8]; Onk. Deut. 4[29]; Vay. R. 32; j. Taan. 66[d]. But in Matt. 7[7f.] (Luke 11[9f.]), where *αἰτεῖν* stands alongside of *ζητεῖν*, some other word must be found for the former. The only term that admits of being proposed is שְׁאַל; see Vay. R. 5, which describes what constitutes judicious and injudicious "asking."

Among the means used to win entrance to the theocracy, there is found, according to Matt. 19[12], self-mutilation, *διὰ τὴν β. τ. οὐρ.* That this is meant figuratively appears most obviously from the consideration that, if it were meant literally, Jesus would here be putting Himself into such an avowed opposition to the Mosaic law as He gives no precedent for elsewhere. Even Josephus[1] affirms that, according to the law, those who emasculated themselves should be excommunicated, and that it was forbidden to castrate men or animals. The application to animals, unexpressed in the law, has been subsequently deduced by the Rabbis, b. Sabb. 110[b],[2] from Lev. 22[24]. A metaphorical use of סָרַס וְגָרַם,

[1] Antt. IV. viii. 40.

[2] See also Onk. and Jerus. I. on Lev. 22[24].

"to castrate one's self," to denote voluntary celibacy, I cannot find in the Rabbinic literature. The saying ascribed to Jesus though not recorded in the Gospels (Agraphon):[1] *ὁ κατὰ πρόθεσιν εὐνουχίας ὁμολογήσας μὴ γῆμαι ἄγαμος διαμενέτω*, succeeds probably in giving the sense of the saying of our Lord, but agrees nevertheless as little with the tendency of Rabbinism as the other. Simeon ben Azzay (*c.* 110 A.D.), who lived unmarried so as not to be impeded in the study of the law, had to bear reproach for his celibacy, and he ranked ever after as a notable exception.[2] A vow of abstinence from conjugal relations would necessarily entail the obligation to dissolve the marriage.

The word that commends itself most to replace *διά*, "for the sake of," is לְשֵׁם. It would also be the most suitable in regard to the leaving of one's family and property "for the sake of" (*εἵνεκεν*) the theocracy, Luke 18[29] (Matt. 19[29] *ἕνεκα τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος*, Mark 10[29] *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*). Similarly, Gamaliel III. (*c.* 210 A.D.) says, Ab. ii. 2: "all those who exert themselves on behalf of the community should do this 'for the sake of God,' לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם"; and Jose ha-Kohen (*c.* 100 A.D.):[3] "may all thy works be performed 'for the sake of God,' לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם."

(*b*) *To give* (*διδόναι*).

To him that asketh "it will be given" (*δοθήσεται*), Matt. 7[7] (Luke 11[9]), and "it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (*δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν*), Luke 12[32]. There can be no doubt that Luke, in placing the latter sentence in sequence to the invitation to seek the kingdom of the Father (v.[31]), has intended "kingdom" to bear the same sense in both cases. Since, however, v.[32] in virtue of the emphasis and content must originally have stood in

[1] Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 15. 97; cf. *Nestle*, Nov. Test. Græc. Supplem. 86.
[2] *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 410.
[3] Ab. ii. 12; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 72.

a *different* connection, the "kingdom" in the words of Jesus is here meant of a special authority destined to devolve upon His disciples, who were for the time being quite powerless. The statement thus belongs to a different series of our Lord's sayings, to which we shall return at the close of this discussion. On the other hand, Matt. 21^{43} belongs to this category, in saying that the theocracy will be "given" to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

For "to give" Aramaic puts at our disposal יְהַב, with imperfect and infinitive formed from the stem נְתַן. But in Galilean these borrowed forms also are occasionally supplied from יְהַב.[1] *Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε* is, therefore, to be thus restored: שְׁאִילוּ[2] וְיָהֲבִין לְכוֹן[3] בְּעוֹ וְאַתּוּן מַשְׁכְּחִין. Bar. Apoc. 44^{15} may be compared: "to these is given the life to come," Syr. להלין מתיהב עלמא דאתי.

(*c*) *To accept, to receive, to take* (*δέχεσθαι, λαμβάνειν*).

One has to "accept" (*δέχεσθαι*) the theocracy, when it is offered, as a little child, Mark 10^{15} (Luke 18^{17}). To this passage Dan. 7^{18} (cf. 6^{1}) יְקַבְּלוּן מַלְכוּתָא, "they will receive the sovereignty," is not available as a parallel, for it means "they shall become rulers." We might with better reason adduce the phrase: קִבֵּל עָלָיו מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, "to take upon oneself the sovereignty of God," or: קִבֵּל עוֹל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, "to take upon one's self the yoke of the sovereignty of God" (see above, p. 98); for in this case the idea of voluntary submission to the divine authority is present, if not also the idea of appropriating a gift. The same verb (קַבֵּל) is found in Dan. 2^{6}, j. Ber. 6^{a}, for the "acceptance" of presents, and is in use, with the same meaning, in the Targ. of Onkelos. In the sense of "accepting" it is applicable in this connection.

"To be received" (Syr. קבל) is predicated of the promised future age, Bar. Apoc. 14^{13} 51^{3}. In the Targ. Cant. 7^{14}

[1] See Gram. d. j.-pal. Aram. 253. [2] Galil. שְׁאֻלוּן. [3] Galil. בְּעוֹן.

it is proclaimed by God to the Messiah, קוּם קַבֵּל מַלְכוּתָא דִּנְנוּיִת לָךְ, "up! receive the sovereignty which I have kept for thee."

From "accept" (actively) is to be distinguished the "taking" (*λαμβάνειν*) of what is bestowed; see Matt. 7^{8} (Luke 11^{10}) 21^{22} (Mark 11^{24}); cf. Bar. Apoc. 51^{3} "that they may take and receive the immortal life" (Syr. דנסבון ונקבלן עלמא דלא מאת). This "taking" is in Aramaic נְסַב.

(*d*) *To take possession of* (*κληρονομεῖν*).

Those who have the right thereto acquire the theocracy as a possession (*κληρονομεῖν*), Matt. 25^{34}, cf. 1 Cor. $6^{9f.}$ 15^{50} Gal. 5^{21}, just as David according to 1 Macc. 2^{57} "received as a possession" the throne of an eternal sovereignty (*ἐκληρονόμησεν*, Syr. Vers. ירת). "To possess one's self of the future age" is a very popular Jewish expression, whose use from the end of the first century onwards can be demonstrated. Bar. Apoc. 44^{13}, cf. 2 Esd. 6^{17}, speaks of "taking possession of the promised age" (Syr. ירת זבנא דאמיר). Eleazar ben Zadok (*c.* 100 A.D.) has יָרַשׁ הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, b. Kidd. 40^{b}. נָחַל חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא is found b. Sot. 7^{b} in a Baraitha; יָרַשׁ חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, j. Pes. 33^{a}. See, further, j. Ber. 11^{a}; יָרַשׁ הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה וְהָעוֹלָם הַבָּא; b. Ber. 51^{a} נָחַל שְׁנֵי עוֹלָמִים; but also יָרַשׁ גַּן עֵדֶן, "to take possession of Paradise," j. Ber. 7^{d}; Aram. יְרַת גַּן עֵדֶן, j. Pea 15^{c}. Besides, we may compare Dan. 7^{18} יְחַסְנוּן מַלְכוּתָא, "they shall possess the sovereignty"; cf. Onk. Gen. 49^{24} אֲחָסִין מַלְכוּתָא, "he took possession of the sovereignty"; Targ. Cant. 1^{3} בְּדִיל דִּיחַסְנוּן עָלְמָא הָדֵין וְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "that they may possess themselves of this age and that which is to come"; Targ. Ruth 2^{13} לְמִחְסַן עָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי; Targ. Jerus. on the Ten Words (Machz. Vitry, 341): יְחַסְנוּן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "the children of Israel will possess themselves of the world to come."

Even in the Old Testament יָרַשׁ and נָחַל can hardly be distinguished in meaning; the Targ. of Onk. replaces יָרַשׁ by

יָרַשׁ and אָחַז, and for נָחַל it has usually אָחַז, without, however, following any recognised principle in this mode of translating. This much, however, is assured, that neither of these words originally means to take possession of a paternal estate, and therefore the rendering by "inherit" is inaccurate. The context must determine whether inheritance is really meant, or whether it is the acquisition of any object to which there previously existed a title, or to which the title was contemporaneous with its acquisition. In Matt. 25^{34} it is the occupation of a possession, antecedently destined for the recipients, that is in view. Of course the idea of the legal title of the heir may also be included, as is the case in Jas. 2^{5}, where the *κληρόνομοι τῆς βασιλείας* are spoken of; and also in Eph. 5^{5}, in the expression: *ἔχειν κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.*

The "taking possession of the theocracy" has a synonym in "taking possession of the earth" (*κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν*) on the part of the meek, Matt. 5^{4}. This phrase has its origin in Ps. 37^{11}, where the meek similarly possess the land (וַעֲנָוִים יִירְשׁוּ אָרֶץ, LXX *οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν (τὴν) γῆν*). That the expression is metaphorical in Matt. 5, there can be no doubt. In the Book of Enoch also $4^{6ff.}$ *κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν* appears to be a name for the collective blessings of salvation received by the "elect." This is expressly stated Sanh. x. 1, where the phrase in Isa. 60^{21} "to possess the land," is explained as referring to participation in the future age.[1] Reference to the same idea may further be seen in Kidd. i. 10: "Every one who fulfils one commandment has the favour of God, and God gives him long life, and he inherits the earth" (וְנוֹחֵל אֶת־הָאָרֶץ). On the other hand, the Book of Jubilees (32^{19}), as well as the Targ. of Onk., understands the promise of possessing the land expressed to Jacob, Gen. 28^{14}, as applying to the possession of the whole earth—

[1] The statement is absent from the Mishna of the Palest. Talmud and from the edition of Lowe.

a view with which Paul agrees when he calls Abraham (Rom. 4[13]) *κληρόνομος τοῦ κόσμου.* Cf. Vay. R. 36. "in time to come they (the Israelites) will take possession of the world from one end to the other" (עֲתִידִין לֵירֵשׁ מִסּוֹף הָעוֹלָם וְעַד סוֹפוֹ).

Only once does Jesus use the expression "to take possession of" in this connection,—apart from the case just mentioned of Matt. 5[4], which is based upon a text in the Psalms,—and this single instance is also found in Matthew. Consequently the phrase, though not uncommon in Jewish literature and employed also by Paul, cannot have been a usual one with Jesus.

Any real parallel to the common Jewish formula: "to have part in the age to come," is entirely wanting in the words of Jesus. See Hebr. יֵשׁ לוֹ—חֵלֶק לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, Tos. Sanh. xiii. 2 (Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, *c.* 100 A.D.); with a negative, אֵין לוֹ—חֵלֶק לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, Tos. Sanh. xiii. 1 (Gamliel II. *c.* 110); אֵין לוֹ—חֵלֶק לָעָתִיד לָבוֹא, j. Sanh. 28[b] (Joshua ben Levi, *c.* 230); j. Shebi. 35[c] (Khamma bar Khanina, *c.* 270); Aram. צַדִּיקַיָּא אִית לְהוֹן חֶלְקָא בְּעָלְמָא הָדֵין וּלְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "the pious have part in this world and in that to come" (cf. 1 Tim. 4[8]), Targ. Esth. ii. 2. 7; חֶלְקָא טָב לֵית לְהוֹן עוֹד עִם צַדִּיקַיָּא לְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, "there remains no more for them a good portion with the pious in the world to come," Targ. Eccl. 9[6]; cf. Targ. Ruth 2[13].—In the New Testament, see *ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ*, Rev. 20[6]; and among the words of Jesus, only *τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει*, Matt. 24[51].

(*e*) *To belong to.*

That which was received, whether it be an actual possession or merely the title thereto, becomes thereafter the peculiar property of the receivers. The theocracy is referred to as such a property in the phrases: *αὐτῶν ἐστίν*, Matt. 5[3] (Luke 6[20] *ὑμετέρα ἐστίν*), and *τῶν τοιούτων ἐστίν*, Matt. 19[14] (Mark 10[14], Luke 18[16]). Aramaic would express

the former merely by הִיא (דִּילְהוֹן), the latter by לְמַן הִיא (דְּכָוָתְהוֹן).

With the former may be compared Bar. Apoc 44[13] "theirs is the earth in the age that is promised" (Syr. דילהן הי ירתותא דזבנא דמליך); and Pesikt. 59[b] (Meïr) הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה שֶׁלָּנוּ וְהָעוֹלָם הַבָּא שֶׁלָּכֶם, "to us (the heathen) is this age, to you (the Jews) is the age to come." For דְּכָוָתְהוֹן may be cited תְּנִי עִם דְּכָוָתִיךְ, "learn thou with thy fellow," Vay. R. 34; אַף חַד דְּכָוָתֵיהּ, "yea even one such," Ech. R. 1[5]; מוֹלִידִין דְּלֵית כָּוָתְהוֹן, "they beget children who are not such as they are," Shir. R. 1[6]; לֵית דְּכָוָתָךְ, "there is none such as thou," Onk. Deut. 33[29]; cf. Targ. Eccl. 7[22]. A fuller expression would be לְמַן דְּדָמֵי לָהוֹן, "of one who resembles them"; cf. Palmyr. Customs Tariff, ii. b. 10: כָּל מָדֵי דָּמֵא לָהוֹן, "everything of that kind."

(f) To be made ready, prepared (ἑτοιμάζεσθαι).

For the righteous the theocracy has been "prepared" (ἡτοιμασμένη), Matt. 25[34], just as eternal fire has been for the wicked, v.[41]. Of the same nature is Matt. 20[23] (Mark 10[40]), which says that to sit at the right hand of the Messianic King is destined for those "for whom it has been prepared—by God" (οἷς ἡτοιμάσται—Matt. ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου). The parable of the Great Supper also treats of a "preparation" (ἑτοιμάζειν), and a "being ready" (ἕτοιμος εἶναι) of the supper, Matt. 22[4. 8] (Luke 14[17]). From Matt. 20[23] it further follows with certainty that the preparation does not necessarily imply the pre-existence of what is prepared, but is synonymous rather with its being "allocated." In the same way Matt. 25[34], according to which the "theocracy" has been "prepared" (Aram. מְעַתַּד or מִתְעַתַּד) for the righteous since the creation of the world, need not be interpreted as signifying its pre-existence.

Similarly in 2 Esd. 8[52] it is said: "prepared is the age to come" (Syr. אתעתד עלמא דעתיד); and in Assump. Moses 1[14] Moses says of himself: "excogitavit et invenit me qui ab initio

orbis terrarum præparatus sum ut sim arbiter testamenti illius"—from which R. H. Charles wrongly infers the personal pre-existence of Moses.[1]

On the other hand, we must not adduce in comparison with the above the Jewish utterances in regard to the pre-existence, or the latent existence for the time being, of things or persons.

Siphre, Deut. 37, ed. Friedm. 76[b], speaking of the law, the temple, and Palestine, declares that these were created before all other things.[2] A certain Baraitha, according to Midr. Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Bem. 17[b], named seven things as having priority to the world: the throne of God, the law, the temple, the patriarchs, Israel, the name of Messiah, and repentance. It is added in the passage that other authorities name also paradise and hell (Gehinnom). The two latter are again adduced b. Ned. 39[b] instead of the patriarchs and Israel. According to Ber. R. 1, which contains the first-named enumeration with Israel omitted, it was, however, only the first couple that were really created before the world, the others being merely designed; and Midr. Psalms (Ps. 93) with a variant list affirms no more than the planning of all the seven items. The tradition was in this case clearly not fixed.

The "light" of Gen. 1[3] has been preserved on behalf of the pious ever since the Creation, Ber. R. 3.[3] Fruits "were made ready for the righteous in Paradise" (אִתְעַתַּדוּ לְצַדִּיקַיָּא בְּגִנְּתָא דְעֵדֶן), Targ. Cant. 8[2]; Perek Gan Khayyim (*Jellinek*, Beth ha-Midrash, v. 47). Wine is kept in its own grape-clusters since the six days of creation (יַיִן הַמְשֻׁמָּר בַּעֲנָבָיו מִשֵּׁשֶׁת יְמֵי בְרֵאשִׁית), b. Sanh. 99[a] (Joshua ben Levy); cf. Targ. Cant. 9[7] (חַמְרָא דְאִצְטְנַע לָךְ בְּגַו עֵדֶן); Pirke Mashiakh (*Jellinek*, Beth-ha-Midrash, iii. 76); Seʿūdath Livyathan, loc. cit. vi. 151;

[1] *R. H. Charles*, The Assumption of Moses (1897), 6. See also my treatise, "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 72.

[2] The idea is somewhat different in Ass. Mos. 1[17], which says that from the beginning Zion was destined to the temple mount.

[3] Cf. "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 58.

Jerus. I. Gen. 27^{25}. As to the fabulous animals, Leviathan and Behemoth, which are destined to supply the "feast of Paradise," see above, p. 110 f. All the above are created things which merely for a time were withdrawn from use.

A pre-existent *Jerusalem*,[1] which in the end descends upon the earth, is the subject of remark in Bar. Apoc. $4^{3ff.}$ though only in an interpolation, in 2 Esd. 13^{36}, and in the Book of Elijah (*Jellinek*, Beth ha-Midrash, iii. 67). In the Testament of Dan. ἡ νέα Ἰερουσαλήμ is referred to as existing at the end, but nothing is said of pre-existence. Meïr[2] (*c.* 160 A.D.), b. Chag. 12^{b}, speaks of there being in the fourth of the seven heavens, Jerusalem, the temple, and an altar on which Michael offers sacrifice; but he does not state that these things are ever destined to be removed to the earth. Yokhanan (*c.* 260) represents God as affirming[3] by an oath: "I shall not enter into the Jerusalem on high until I be come into the Jerusalem on earth." That the earthly Jerusalem should at some future day be replaced by the heavenly, follows neither from this statement nor from the kindred paraphrase of Ps. 122^{3} in the Targum. Midrash Tanchuma, Par. Pikkude (near beginning, ed. Venice, 1545, 50^{a} f., not in ed. Buber), correctly apprehends the passages cited in saying that God through His great love for Jerusalem on earth had fashioned for Himself a heavenly counterpart of it into which His glory (Shekina) was not to enter until the desolate Jerusalem on earth should again be built up. Thus the belief in a celestial pre-existence of the Jerusalem to come is restricted within very narrow limits in the Jewish literature. And in the New Testament, what is said of Jerusalem "that is above," or the "heavenly Jerusalem,"

[1] *Chr. Schoettgen's* treatise, De Hierosolyma cælesti in his Hor. hebr. et talm. 1205–1248, chiefly on account of including misunderstood Cabbalistic material, is more perplexing than instructive.

[2] Meïr, according to *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 65. The text of the Talmud names Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 260 A.D.).

[3] b. Taan. 5^{a}; Midr. Psalms 122^{3}.

Gal. 4^{26}, Heb. 12^{22}, must not be combined with the statements concerning Jerusalem coming down from heaven, Rev. 3^{12} $21^{2.10}$.

The name of the Messiah is premundane according to the Book of Enoch 48^{3} (Similitudes), and the Baraitha given above on the things that were prior to the world, also according to Targ. Mich. 5^{1}, Zech. 4^{7}. A personal existence of the Messiah, celestial though not premundane, is taught Enoch $39^{6f.}$ 46^{1} 62^{7} (Similitudes), — Enoch 48^{6}, with its contention that the Messiah is prior to the world, is an interpolation,—2 Esd. 12^{32} $13^{26.52}$ 14^{9}, and after that not again till Pesikt. Rabb. chap. 33 (ed. Friedm. 152^{b}).[1] This differs somewhat from the occult existence of the Messiah before His open manifestation upon the earth or in Paradise, if in the latter case He is temporarily transferred thither from the earth.[2] The statements as to pre-existence in the Similitudes of Enoch, of 2 Esdras, and in Pesikta Rabbati, moreover do not presuppose any human birth of Messiah. He is to make His appearance upon earth as a fully developed personality. And this is quite distinct from the later Jewish doctrine of the pre-existence of the souls of all men. Judaism has never known anything of a pre-existence peculiar to the Messiah *antecedent to His birth as a human being.* Baldensperger,[3] nevertheless, holds that from the date of the Similitudes of Enoch, "the heavenly pre-existence of the Messiah" attained the position of a "dogma in apocalyptic circles." But we have seen that after the Similitudes of Enoch the only representatives of the idea independent of Enoch are 2 Esdras in the first Christian century, and the Appendix to Pesikta Rabbati, independently of both these sources, in the seventh or eighth century. The dominance

[1] Cf. "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 58.

[2] Loc. cit. 39, 77 f.

[3] *W. Baldensperger*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit[2] (1892), 85. In other points, too, the statements of this book on Jewish matters require careful revision.

of the idea in any Jewish circle whatever cannot seriously be upheld.

With what is advanced on p. 128 f., as well as under VIII. 3,—based on admittedly meagre data,—may be compared the words of *E. Schürer*, Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes [2] ii. 423 [3 ii. 503], Eng. Tr. Div. II. vol. ii. p. 133 f., which have caused various mischief in the New Testament theology of the last decade,[1] "All the blessings of the future world come down from above, from heaven, where they have previously existed from all eternity. There they are treasured up for the pious as an 'inheritance' which will one day be apportioned to them. In particular, there already exists there the all-glorious new Jerusalem, which in the time of the consummation will descend to the earth to replace the former city. There, too, already exists in the fellowship of God the *Messiah*, who has been chosen by God from all eternity as the perfect king of Israel. Every good and perfect thing, indeed, can come down only from above, while every earthly thing in its present condition is the direct contradiction of the divine. Ultimately, therefore, the hope for the future generally supersedes the limits of this earthly existence. Not even in the Kingdom of Glory upon the *renovated* earth is the final salvation to be found, but in a state of absolute transfiguration in heaven."

Of all this the beginning and end are quite inaccurate; as for the rest, it is true that such ideas have occasionally presented themselves in sporadic fashion in Judaism. But a picture of "the Messianic hope" among the Jews in the time of Christ ought never to have been given in these terms. The conception of God and his control of the world was in that age more transcendental and supernatural than at an earlier period. That the future salvation should for that reason have been apprehended more and more as

[1] See, *e.g.*, *H. H. Wendt*, Die Lehre Jesu, ii. (1890) 297; *A. Titius*, Die neutest. Lehre von der Seligkeit, i. (1895) 6.

"purely transcendental," is an idea that is justifiable only to a very limited extent.

(*g*) *To take away* (*αἴρειν*).

What has been given may be "taken away" again. The theocracy will "be taken away" (*ἀρθήσεται*), Matt. 21[43], from the Jews, as from those who have the first claim to its possession. The whole verse recalls 1 Sam. 15[18], where, however, in place of "to take away" the verb used is "to rend away from" (Hebr. קָרַע, Targ. אַעְדֵי). "To take away" is in Aramaic נְטַל or נְסַב. For the former, which appears to correspond to an older usage,[1] see Targ. Eccl. 2[15] אִתְנְטַלַת מִנַּיהּ מַלְכוּתָא, "the sovereignty was taken from him"; Midr. Abba Gorion 1[1] אִתְנְטַלָא יְקָרָא דִבְנֵי אֱנָשָׁא, "the lordship of men was taken away." For the latter, which answers to the Galilean usage, see אִתְנְסִיב הוֹדָא מִן בְּרִיָתָא, "the excellency was taken away from men," Est. R. 1[1].

7. THE SOVEREIGNTY OF MESSIAH.

Lastly, there fall to be enumerated the passages in which the sovereignty of the Messiah is spoken of. Here we encounter the expression *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ*, Matt. 16[28] (Mark 9[1], and Luke 9[27] *τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*); *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου*, Matt. 20[21] (Mark 10[37] *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου*), Luke 23[42]; *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου*, Luke 22[30]. Just as in Dan. 6[29] בְּמַלְכוּת דָּרְיָוֶשׁ must be translated "during the reign of Darius," so is it with *ἐν τῇ βασ. μου, σου, αὐτοῦ* in this case; and the equivalent Aramaic בְּמַלְכוּתִי, בְּמַלְכוּתָךְ, בְּמַלְכוּתֵיהּ, would have to be rendered "when I am king," etc., and Luke 23[42] merely "as king."

"Out of His sovereignty" (*ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ*), the angels of the Son of Man "gather together"[2] all causes

[1] See the Neo-Hebraic נָטַל, "to take away," Sabb. i. 1.

[2] The metaphor is borrowed from the harvest-field.

of offence and evil-doers, Matt. 13[41]. According to Luke 22[29] the Messiah "gives in charge" (*διατίθεσθαι*, Aram. מְסַר) to His own, who thereby themselves obtain the rank of rulers, that sovereignty which was committed by God to Himself; and from Luke 12[32] the "giving" (*διδόναι*, Aram. יְהַב)[1] of the sovereignty to the little flock appears to have been so destined from the first (see above, p. 124). This *βασιλεία*, which is allotted by God through the Messiah to His disciples, is sharply distinguished from that which is elsewhere called *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*. In this case it is merely a ruler's prerogative that is bestowed, whereas *ἡ β. τ. θ.*, as being a gift to men, never contains, and, from its associations, is incapable of containing, such a significance. Two distinct series of ideas are presented. The one connects itself with Dan. 7[14. 27], where the "sovereignty," מַלְכוּתָא, is assigned first to the Son of Man, and then to the saints of the Most High. The other series of ideas is founded probably upon Dan. 2[44], which says that the "God of heaven" will at the end set up an imperishable "sovereignty" (יְקִים אֱלָהּ שְׁמַיָּא מַלְכוּ דִי לְעָלְמִין לָא תִתְחַבַּל), which will annihilate all other sovereignties. Here too, however, it must be emphasised, that Jesus has given to the thought in the Book of Daniel a new application originally foreign to it, which excludes the idea of an "establishment" of the theocracy, although, indeed, in Acts 1[6] the term in question[2] is used to denote the royal sovereignty of Israel.

8. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION.

The use of מַלְכוּתָא in certain cases to denote the *sphere* of the sovereignty of God is rarely found in the mouth of Jesus. The use of מַלְכוּת for "realm," in the secular sense,

[1] Cf. Dan. 7[27] יְהִיבַת — מַלְכוּתָא.

[2] *ἀποκαθιστάνειν*, in the Christian-Palestinian version אקים; *A. Lewis*, A Palestinian Syrian Lectionary, 132.

is found, indeed, in the late books of the Old Testament, *e.g.* 2 Chron. 20^{30} 36^{22}, Esth. 3^{6} $5^{1.3}$ 7^{2}, Dan. 9^{1} 11^{9}, and Aram. Ezra 7^{13}, Dan. 4^{15} 5^{11}. But even this application of the word to earthly "kingdoms" is rare in the subsequent Jewish literature.[1] In this literature מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם is never once used to specify the locus of the divine sovereign power. It denotes always this power itself in its present and future manifestation,[2] without implying that the idea was or tended to become distinctively eschatological. The notion of any transference of the divine sovereignty to another is accordingly never entertained in the Jewish literature. And Jesus, likewise, never says that God should hand over *His own* sovereignty to the Messiah. To the Messiah, according to Luke 22^{29}, God grants the rōyal dignity, *i.e.* that which is peculiar to the Messiah, and He on His part, again, imparts it to His own disciples. Still less can any unmediated transference of the divine lordship to men be contemplated. The parallels adduced above from the Jewish literature have proved that the true affinity of the idea of the sovereignty of God, as taught by Jesus, is to be found, not so much in the Jewish conception of מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם as in the idea of the "future age" (הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא), or that of the "life of the future age" (חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא). This conception is among the Jews, in a similar way, a comprehensive term for the blessings of salvation, just as the "sovereignty of God" is with Jesus; and, further, the "sovereignty of God" is for Jesus invariably an eschatological entity, of which a present can be predicted only because "the end" is already approaching. It is not unlikely that in the time of Jesus the idea of "the future age," being the product of the schools of the scribes, was not yet familiar to those He addressed; see under No. II. It cannot therefore be said that He rejected it, and intentionally substituted another term in place of it. Independently of the schools and of the apoca-

[1] See above, p. 95 f. [2] Cf. p. 96 ff.

lyptic literature of His time, He created His own terminology. We may assume that He borrowed the term "sovereignty of God" as an eschatological designation from the Book of Daniel, and that He used it by preference for the reason that regard for the honour of God took precedence in His view of all else, and also because He considered it certain that the chief end of mankind was to find their salvation in the most intimate relation to God, and in full obedience to His will. He was further convinced that the purpose of God was directed principally to the bestowal of blessing on men, and not to the mere exaltation of the divine majesty over the world. Hence, in His view, the completed establishment of God as sovereign implied, for those who experienced it, absolute happiness.

This thought was not entirely new. That Jahve's kingship, especially in so far as Israel is concerned, but also in its extension over all peoples, has for aim and result the happiness of men, is clearly stated, among other passages, in Ps. 96–99.[1] Translated into the style of the earlier Targums, Ps. 97[1] would run:[2] "the royal sovereignty of the Lord has become manifest; let the earth rejoice; let all the isles be glad." The king, of course, is there regarded principally as the judge of his people, and the judge is ranked first and foremost as the vindicator and deliverer.[3] At the same time it must be noticed that in the Old Testament period from the time of Chronicles the tendency arises to speak less of the king Yahve, and of His "being" or

[1] On this point see *J. Boehmer*, Das Reich Gottes in den Psalmen, Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. 1897, pp. 620–651, 746–763, 819–840; also *H. Roy*, Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter (J. B. des theol. Sem. d. Brgem. 1896, 1897), 32.

[2] The extant Jewish Targum to the Psalms was composed at a late date, and is of little use for our purpose.

[3] See my treatise, "Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im A. T.," 1897, 10 f.; and *T. K. Cheyne*, The Origin and religious Contents of the Psalter (1891), 344: "The essential part of deity as well as of royalty—was ability to help or save."

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"becoming" king, and more of His "kingly sovereignty" (מַלְכוּת),—a tendency which in the Targums has led to the regular insertion of the abstract מַלְכוּתָא wherever God is represented in the Old Testament as personally ruling like a king. This change is the result of an advance in the idea of God, which went beyond the more childlike conceptions of earlier times, and also an advance in the general mode of thought because the formation of abstract terms became more and more a necessity. Thus, then, the "kingly-sovereignty" of God appears as the decisive element in the salvation of the community of revelation with reference to its present and to its future.

There was already in existence, prior to the time of Jesus, a tendency which laid little stress on the Jewish national element in the hope for the future.[1] This aspect of the future hope Jesus thrust still further into the background, placing the purely religious element decisively in the foreground, and He thereby extended the conception of the "sovereignty of God" so as to include within it the blessings mediated by this sovereignty. For Him the sovereignty of God meant the divine power which, from the present onwards with continuous progress, effectuates the renovation of the world, but also the renovated world into whose domain mankind will one day enter, which is even now being offered, and therefore can be appropriated and received as a blessing.

It must not, moreover, be forgotten that the preaching of Jesus in regard to the sovereignty of God was directed to a people among whom large sections not only fixed their aspirations on the restoration of the "sovereignty," *i.e.* the political independence of Israel, but were themselves eager to take active measures in setting up this sovereignty. According to the statement of Josephus,[2] Judah[3] of Gaulonitis, from

[1] This is the subject of remark in *O. Holtzmann*, Neutest. Zeitgeschichte (1895), 243 f.

[2] Antt. xviii. i. 1, 6; Bell. Jud. ii. viii. 1.

[3] Cf. Acts 5^{37}.

the city of Gamala, in the time of Jesus called the movement of the "zealots" into active life. Their principle was to recognise God alone and no man as the "leader and Lord" over Israel (*ἡγημόνα καὶ δεσπότην*). The sons of this man, Jacob, Simon, and Menahem, and another of his kindred, Eleazar, continued this agitation of Judah till after the destruction of Jerusalem.[1] This party also included Judah, son of Hezekiah, who just after the death of Herod made himself master of Zeppori, the chief city of Galilee in the neighbourhood of Nazareth, and who is represented as having aimed at usurping the sovereign power.[2] This movement, to which one of His own disciples had once adhered, must have been well known to Jesus. From the account of the Temptation it appears that the tempter had sought to suggest similar ideas in his own inner consciousnesss. Moreover, it is indubitable that He developed His own ideas in regard to the sovereignty of God in conscious opposition to the Zealot movement. His verdict as to the tribute-money, Matt. 22^{21} (Mark 12^{17}, Luke 20^{25}), shows that He did not consider the political dominance of the Romans to be any infringement of the sovereignty of God. It is not the rule of foreigners over the nation, but the rule of all ungodly powers in the inner life of men, that the sovereignty of God aims at removing; and it is no human agency, not even the Messiah, that by earthly means establishes this sovereignty, but God Himself; for this He does for the present through the mere word of preaching and through miracle; in the future, however, through the complete advent of supramundane power into this present world. Lütgert[3] rightly lays stress on the fact that the kingdom of

[1] Antt. xx. v. 2; Bell. Jud. ii. xvii. 8, vii. viii. 1.

[2] Antt. xvii. x. 5; Bell. Jud. ii. iv. 1. In contrast with this case, the name Juda, son of Sepperaios (*υἱὸς Σεπφεραίου*), has nothing to do with Zeppori. This name, according to Bell. Jud. i. xxxiii. 2, was that of one of the two teachers of the law who cut down the golden eagle of Herod from the temple gate; see also Antt. xvii. vi. 2 (which has *ὁ Σαριφαίου*). The resemblance is really with the Palmyrene proper name אספא, Σεφφερᾶς, de Vogüé, x. 11.

[3] *W. Lütgert*, Das Reich Gottes nach den synoptischen Evangelien (1895), 26.

God is regarded by Jesus principally as "a gift of God." Schnedermann,[1] on the other hand, is mistaken in asserting that Jesus "adopted from the people of His time the representation of the kingdom of God with all its peculiar traits, including even the very considerable tinge of national-political elements."[2] Wellhausen has very properly struck out sentences of similar tendency to be found in the first edition of his Israelitish and Jewish History.[3] The genuine nature of the preaching of Jesus, not less than of the doctrine of Judaism, is entirely misrepresented by such statements.

It was not merely the content of the conception which forms the kernel of our Lord's teaching that was new and original, but also His application of the term, despite the fact that the phrase selected originally belonged to the religious vocabulary of the Jews. The theocracy about to make its entrance into the world was something more than a gratifying realisation of the hopes entertained regarding it; it was a creative force bringing new ideas in its train.

Appendix A.

Luke 16^{16} *ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι* (D *ἕως*) *Ἰωάννου* (D add. *ἐπροφήτευσαν*)· *ἀπὸ τότε* (D *αποτε*)[4] *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.* Matt. $11^{12f.}$ *ἀπὸ δὲ* (D om. *δὲ*) *τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ* (D add. *οἱ*) *βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν. Πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου ἐπροφήτευσαν.*

[1] Jesu Verkündigung und Lehre vom Reiche Gottes, i. 152.

[2] See also *Schnedermann's* sentence, Wissenschaftl. Beilage zur Leipz. Zeitung, 1897, No. 44, "The kingdom preached by Jesus was none other than that so long desired by His people, the kingdom of God for Israel."

[3] Cf. Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte, ed. i. (1894) 308, with edition iii. (1897) 374.

[4] *Blass* rejects *ἕως* and *ἐπροφήτευσαν*, but adopts *ἀφ' ὅτου* (instead of *αποτε*), as required by the Roman recension.

In the first place, we have to ask what Aramaic word may be the antecedent of *βιάζειν*. A. Meyer[1] recommends חֲסַן, the Aphel form of which, by analogy with Dan. $7^{18.\ 22}$, would be preferable. Still אַחְסֵן, which means merely "to take possession of," would hardly cause one who was writing in Greek to use *βιάζειν*. A better equivalent is found in תְּקַף, which means in the Peal "to be strong," and in the Aphel "to hold fast." In Deut. 22^{25} Onkelos has וַיַּתְקֵף בַּהּ for the Hebr. וַיַּחֲזֵק בָּהּ, while the LXX renders by *βιασάμενος*. In 2 Sam. $13^{25.\ 27}$ for the Hebr. פָּרַץ בּ, "to urge upon any one," the Targum has again אַתְקֵף בּ, and for פָּרַץ, Gen. 28^{14}, Ex. 1^{12}, Onkelos has the Peal תְּקַף. The Ithpaal אִתַּתַּקַּף is found in Gen. 48^{2} and Num. 13^{20} for the Hebr. הִתְחַזֵּק, "to strengthen one's self," and in 1 Kings 12^{18} for הִתְאַמֵּץ, "to exert one's self." It is also important to note that תְּקַף has no passive any more than חָזַק[2] in the older Hebrew. From this it would follow that the passive *βιάζεται*, Matt. $11^{12,3}$ is not derived immediately from an Aramaic prototype. The same test applies to the passive *εὐαγγελίζεται* in Luke, since אִתְבַּשַּׂר can mean only "to receive a message." The word *ἐπροφήτευσαν* in Matthew, for which *ὁ νόμος* is an unsuitable subject, also raises suspicion. And as it is not original in Luke, and therefore need not be considered indispensable, it can hardly be attributed to the original utterance.—The more precise designation of John as "the Baptist" in Matthew is similarly to be regarded as secondary. If it had to be reproduced in Aramaic, then the Syriac מַעְמְדָנָא (as in Jerus. Gosp. Matt. 11^{12}) would be as inapt as מַצְבְּעָנָא (loc. cit. Matt. 11^{11}). Wellhausen,[4] indeed, supposes that "the

[1] Jesu Muttersprache, 88 f., cf. 157 f.

[2] Only the Chronicler has as passive הִתְחַזֵּק, meaning "to be consolidated," 2 Chron. 1^{1}.

[3] *Deissmann*, Neue Bibelstudien, 85 f. [Bible Studies, 258], recalls the fact that *βιάζομαι* may also be used as a middle voice, and absolutely, meaning "to appear with force." But one can here found nothing on the "exercise of compulsion" in the theocracy.

[4] *J. Wellhausen*, Der arabische Josippon (1897), 43.

word 'Schmatten' in colloquial Jewish usage has been derived from עמד," and thus proves the occurrence of this verb among the Jews, with the meaning "to baptize." But the Jewish שְׁמַד, as may be seen from the use of the word in the Talmud, has nothing whatever to do with "baptizing," and עַמַד in this sense is quite unknown among the Jews. "To make one take a bath by immersion" is expressed among them by אַטְבֵּל, b. Yeb. 45[b]; Hebr. הִטְבִּיל, j. Yeb. 8[d]; b. Nidd. 32[a]. The corresponding Aram. noun would be מַטְבְּלָנָא, formed like מוֹרְיָנָא, "teacher of the law"; מְתְנְיָנָא, "teacher of the Mishna"; מַלְפָנָא, "teacher"; מְרַבְּיָנָא, "tutor."

We conclude accordingly that the first sentence (in Luke) might be presented as follows:—

אוֹרִיתָא וּנְבִיאַיָּא עַד יוֹמֵי יוֹחָנָן· מִן הָכָא וּלְהָלָא מַלְכוּתָא דְשָׁמַיָּא.

The second sentence admits of being retraced to כָּל מַן דְּמִתְקֵף בַּהּ יַתְקֵף. This can mean "every one can lay hold of it," *i.e.* "it is attainable for every one." It may also, however, imply: "He who does not shun the requisite effort may take possession of it." Further, in case of need one might also read: כָּל מַן דְּמִתְקֵף יַתְקֵף בַּהּ, "every one who exerts himself possesses himself of it." Somewhat thus it may have been understood by Matthew. And, finally, there remains the possibility of attaching the second half of the first clause to the second clause, so that the latter should then read: מִן הָכָא וּלְהָלָא מַלְכוּתָא דְשָׁמַיָּא כָּל מַן דְּמִתְקֵף בַּהּ יַתְקֵף, "from that time and onwards the sovereignty of God—every man who will lay hold upon it lays hold of it." This perhaps may be presupposed in Luke.

To all this it may, however, be objected that the Greek form of our Lord's saying does not after all in either case tally closely with the Aramaic expression. A solution which should be in congruity with the tenor of the Greek would merit the preference. Such a solution for the wording of the phrase in Matthew may be arrived at, provided אָנַס be made the starting-point, for this word can mean "to use force"

and "to rob." In that case the original utterance would be: מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא מִן יוֹמֵי יוֹחָנָן וְעַד [1] כְּעַן מִתְאַנְסָה וְאָנוֹסִין [2] אֲנָסוּהָא. The text thus refers to that period of the theocracy which was introduced by the imprisonment of the Baptist; it is its peculiarity that the theocracy suffers violence, not, of course, from believers, but from those in authority. The words *ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν*, corresponding to אֲנָסוּהָא, are not intended to suggest that the violent rulers seize the theocracy, but merely that they maltreat it in the persons of its representatives.

The utterance is found in Luke in an entirely different connection. According to him, it is applied in opposition to the Pharisees, who despised the admonition of Jesus in regard to the right use of money. Jesus declares to them that the proclamation of the theocracy since the time of John made it possible for any one to intrude himself violently into it; but nevertheless it was not their own estimate, but the judgment of God, that decided who was worthy of entrance. The context, however, in Luke may be pronounced peculiarly Greek. Neither the passive *εὐαγγελίζεται* (see above) nor *εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται* are capable of being directly rendered into Aramaic, especially not in case אֱנַס is used. If it be supposed that, by using (vv.[15–18]) sayings of our Lord which originally had a quite different association, Luke obtains the transition to a new parable, then it may be surmised that he himself has given to v.[16] its present form, so as to accommodate the saying to the context. The saying which Matthew and Luke found in their sources made mention only of the violent treatment of the theocracy since the time of John. Luke thought upon attempted entrance into it, and thus found it natural to insert it in the position which it occupies in his Gospel; Matthew—with greater reason—understood it to refer to the violent treatment of the preachers of the theocracy, and has therefore connected

[1] Galil. כְּדוּן. [2] Galil. אֲנַסְנָתָא.

it with the answer sent by Jesus to John. Neither by Jesus nor by the evangelists is the statement intended to suggest that any one could actually appropriate the theocracy through the exercise of force. Unless absolutely driven to it, we ought not to try to discover beneath these words an idea so distinctly at variance with the whole style of our Lord's teaching.

Appendix B.

Luke $17^{20.\,21}$ *οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἢ* (D add. *ἰδοὺ*) *ἐκεῖ* (D add. *μὴ πιστεύσητε*).[1] *ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.*

For *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* Delitzsch puts בְּמַרְאֵה עֵינַיִם in his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew—not, indeed, without much misgiving, as may be seen from his private copy. The Talmudic בְּפוֹמְבֵּי, "in triumphal parade," *πομπή*, had appeared to him not impossible; but in publishing the 11th edition the present writer did not venture to adopt it. Salkinson renders it by לְעֵינֵי הַמַּבִּיט, Resch by בְּשִׁמּוּרִים, the Syriac version, Sin. Cur. Pesch. has בנטורתא, "with observation." Meyer[2] proposes בְּנָטִיר, which, according to the Targ. Job 4^{12}, he takes to mean "in secret." In that case the evangelist misunderstood the word. But בְּנָטִיר, even in Job 4^{12}, can mean merely "by lying in wait for," *i.e.* as robbers lie in wait for any one; cf. Targ. Job 10^{14}. It is not amiss to adduce as a parallel topic a certain Baraitha given b. Sanh. 97ᵃ. Rab Zera there appeals to those who busy themselves speculating about the date of the redemption: "By your leave! hinder it not, I beseech you (by your inquiries); for we have it by tradition: שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּאִין בְּהֶפְסֵח הַדַּעַת אֵילּוּ הֵן מָשִׁיחַ מְצִיאָה וְעַקְרָב, there are three things which come

[1] Both insertions in D are omitted by Blass in his so-called Roman recension of the text of Luke.

[2] Jesu Muttersprache, 87.

unexpectedly (literally, while the attention is diverted); what are they? the Messiah, treasure-trove, and a scorpion." The Palestinian Talmud generally uses בְּהֶפֵּעַ הד׳ for בְּהֶפֵּחַ הד׳, putting ע instead of ח. The expression is also quite possible in Aramaic, as may be seen from j. Taan. 67[b] (j. Meg. 75[c]): "I looked up (at the priests pronouncing the benediction), but my attention was not thereby diverted, וְלָא כַּפִּיעָה דַּעְתִּי"; and again in j. Taan. 64[b] מָה הֲוֵינָה [1] מַפַּע דַּעְתִּי מִן פֻּעָלְתִּי, "why was I to turn away my attention from my work?" The contrary of אַפַּע דַּעְתֵּיהּ is properly perhaps כַּפִּין דַּעְתֵּיהּ, b. Ber. 30[b]; cf. simply כַּפִּין, j. Ber. 5[a], or יְהַב דַּעְתֵּיהּ, j. Sabb. 10[d] "to pay regard to anything." But it is the unexpected and startling aspect of Messiah's coming that is emphasised in the Baraitha; whereas Jesus appears to have in view the unostentatious advent of the theocracy. It is certainly not "attention" which He wishes to exclude. This being so, the words *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* require no other term than נְטַר, for this, without doubt, has the force of "to observe, watch for"; see Onk. Gen. 3[15], Targ. Jer. 8[7], Eccles. 11[4], Ber. R. 78, and the corresponding Hebr. שָׁמַר, Siphre, Deut. 127 (ed. Friedm. 100[b]). It had at the same time the meaning "to wait for"; see the phrase of the Mishna, שׁוֹמֶרֶת יָבָם, "the widow who waits for her husband's brother," Yeb. iv. 3, and the parallels in the Targum Jerus. I. Num. 27[4], Ruth 1[13]. Consequently, it is only the context of our Lord's saying that can determine the precise sense in which נטר is there used. And the context favours "to watch for, to be on the outlook for." The literal translation of *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*, which would have to be by בְּנָטִירוּתָא or בִּנְטִירוּ,[2] sounds to me unidiomatic. Might not כְּדִנְטַרִין לֵהּ, "if one lies in wait for it," meet the case? The future *ἐροῦσιν* is distinctly unsuitable where it

[1] So it should be read. The emendation מְסָעֲר, proposed in my "Aram. Dialektproben," 29, is erroneous.

[2] The substantive נְטִיר, "observation," given in the Lexicon of *Levy* and *Jastrow*, is doubtful. In Ex. 12[42] Onk. נְטִיר is in both cases of its use the Passive Participle, as may be seen in Jerus. I. II. בְּנָטִיר occurs only Job 4[12].

stands, whereas in v.[23] it is quite in its place. The whole clause v.[21a] is probably an interpolation introduced from v.[23].

The following would be a possible retranslation: מַלְכוּתָא דְשָׁמַיָּא לֵית הִיא אָתְיָא בִּנְטִירוּ (וְלָא יֵימְרוּן עַלַּהּ הָא [1] כָּא הִיא אוֹ הָא תַּמָּן הִיא).

For *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*, the Syriac, Sin. Cur. Pesch. has בינתכון, "among you," Delitzsch and Salkinson have בְּקִרְבְּכֶם, Resch (following Ephrem) בִּלְבַבְכֶם, Meyer לְגוֹ מִנָּכוֹן. In Meyer's opinion the phrase is meant to indicate the sudden manifestation of the theocracy. But the most important element in that view—the suddenness—would fail to be expressed in the phrase, so Meyer conjectures that בנוכן was perhaps miswritten for בחכוף. As to the Aramaic term in question here, it is a striking circumstance that the Hebr. בְּקֶרֶב, in the sense of "among," is rendered in the Targums by בְּגוֹ when it is followed by a substantive, but generally by בֵּינֵי when it is attached to a pronominal suffix. Thus in Deut. 18[2] Onkelos has: "he shall have no inheritance among his brethren (בְּגוֹ אֲחוֹהִי)," but Ex. 17[7] "Is, then, the presence of God among us (בֵּינָנָא)?" Specially significant is Targ. Jud. 1[29] "the Canaanites dwelt among them, בֵּינֵיהוֹן," and 1[33] "they dwelt among the Canaanites (בְּגוֹ כְּנַעֲנָאֵי)." The same rule applies to בְּתוֹךְ. Thus בְּקֶרֶב and בְּתוֹךְ, having suffixes attached, can be rendered by בְּגַוֵּיהּ, בְּגַוָּהּ, only when they mean "within"; see for בְּקֶרֶב, Onk. Gen. 18[24]; for בְּתוֹךְ, Onk. Gen. 41[48], Lev. 11[33], Num. 35[34]; cf. Gen. 23[9] 35[2].

Thus there are only two options possible for Luke 17[21].[2] The reading is either בֵּינֵיכוֹן, and this meant "among you," or else בְּגַוֵּיכוֹן, with the sense of "within you." With the

[1] The double use of בָּרָא would also be possible, as in Vay. R. 34: אֵין הָדָא אָזִיל בְּרָה הָא אָזִיל בְּרָה וְאֵין לָא הָוָה אָזִיל בְּרָה אֶמּוֹר הָא אָזִיל בְּרָא (ed. Constant. wrongly בראי), "when he (who flees before the Roman power) is come here (say): Lo, he goes there! and when he has not come here, say: Lo, he is come here!"

[2] For the simple בְּ, which can also mean "in" and "among," we should expect *ἐν* in Greek.

latter compare Ezra 5^{7} בְּגַוֵּהּ, and בְּגַוַּהּ, j. Ned. 39^{b}, j. Keth. 31^{c}, where in each case the reference is to the matter contained "in" a written document. Both words are found j. Taan. 66^{c}. Khanina dwells בְּגַוֵּיהּ, "in it," *i.e.* in a certain street, and he is בֵּינֵיכוֹן,[1] "among you," *i.e.* the inhabitants of Zeppori. Against בְּגַוְּכוֹן it appears an objection that it is the Pharisees who are addressed; but this cannot be considered a final criterion, for the historical situation, where the saying of the Lord is introduced, cannot lay claim to the same degree of certitude as the saying itself. A complete negation of *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* required the affirmation of an advent of the theocracy in the secrecy of men's hearts. In other places Luke has *ἐν μέσῳ* for "among"; see Luke 2^{46} 8^{7} 10^{3} $22^{27.55}$ 24^{36}, Acts 1^{15} 2^{22} 27^{21}. When he writes *ἐντός* in this case, he certainly means something more than "among," namely, "within." Hence the closing phrase would run: דְּהָא מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא בְּגַוְּכוֹן הִיא. Ephrem is therefore quite right with his rendering "in your heart," although his exemplar can hardly have been so expressed. What Jesus had in view in this utterance was the unseen genesis of the theocracy caused by the "Word," and its effectual working, as the latter is set forth in the parables of the Sower (Luke $8^{4ff.}$), the Grain of Mustard-seed, and the Leaven (Luke $13^{18ff.}$). Such an inner advent of the sovereignty of God realised itself in all those to whom the teaching of Jesus had access. Jesus might, therefore, in the word for *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* have in view the general company of His hearers. Even Luke felt no necessity to exclude the Pharisees, and thus remained free to place this paradox, tending rather to veil than to explain the dictum, as an answer to the Pharisees in clear contrast with the very different instruction communicated by Jesus to His own disciples. Again, in Luke 11^{20} (Matt. 12^{28}) Jesus says even to the Pharisees when they had obdurately

[1] The proper reading is בֵּינֵיכוֹן. In the Venice edition ביניכון יתב should be read instead of בינבי ויתב.

refused to recognise the divine power as effectual through Him: *ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, "the theocracy is come upon you."[1] In that case it is the power of Jesus against evil spirits which makes the theocracy recognisable even to outward vision; in the passage under consideration, it appears through the power of the Word invisibly, but not, therefore, less effectually.

II. THE FUTURE AGE, THE AGE (ÆON).

1. ITS OCCURRENCE IN THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

To him who speaks against the Holy Ghost forgiveness is denied, both *ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι* as well as *ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*, Matt. 12[32]. But v.[32] is merely a repetition of v.[31], which, like Luke 12[10], mentions the unpardonable sin, omitting the addition, while Mark 3[29] states that the non-remission is valid "for evermore" (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*); cf. the phrase: אֵין לוֹ מְחִילָה עוֹלָמִית, "there is no forgiveness for him for ever," j. Bab. b. 6[c] (Josa).[2] The more detailed statement of Matt. 12[32] appears to have grown out of the shorter form, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, in Mark. Hence no certain inference can be drawn in this instance as to the precise words used by Jesus Himself.

In Mark 10[30] (Luke 18[30]) *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ* and *ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ* are placed in contrast, while in Matt. 19[29] neither one or other is found. In Luke 20[34f.] *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* are found alongside of *οἱ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν*; but Matt. 22[30], Mark 12[25] have nothing corresponding. Elsewhere, again in Luke (16[8]), *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* occurs as antithesis to the *υἱοὶ*

[1] *O. Schmoller*, Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes (1891), 140 ff., successfully draws attention to the inner connection between Luke 11[20] and Luke 17[20].

[2] The shorter form, אֵין לוֹ מְחִילָה, is seen, *e.g.*, Ab. d. R. Nathan (39) (Akiba); cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 287.

τοῦ φωτός—without any parallel in the other Synoptists. In addition to these, we have also ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. 13[22] (Mark 4[19] αἱ μέριμναι τ. α.), but not in Luke, and the expression peculiar to Matthew, ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος. Hence it is clear that the ideas, "this age," "the future age," *if Jesus used them at all*, were not of importance in His vocabulary. As observed above (p. 135), the idea of the "sovereignty of God" filled the place of that of the "future age."

Paul also speaks, and that frequently, of "this age" (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος), see Rom. 12[2], 1 Cor. 1[20] 2[6. 8] 3[18], 2 Cor. 4[4], Eph. 1[21]; "this present age" (ὁ νῦν αἰών), 1 Tim. 6[17], 2 Tim. 4[10], Tit. 2[12], cf. Gal. 1[4]; "the time that now is" (ὁ νῦν καιρός), Rom. 8[18]; "this world" (ὁ κόσμος οὗτος), 1 Cor. (1[20]) 3[19] 5[10] 7[31], Eph. 2[2]; but only in Eph. 1[21] is "the future age" (ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων, cf. Eph. 2[7] "the ages to come") spoken of. The place of the latter is elsewhere occupied by ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. The same holds good of the Johannine Gospel. The correlative of "this world," "this age," is properly not "that æon," and never "that other world," but "the sovereignty of God," and the "eternal life."

2. ORIGIN OF THE EXPRESSION.

In pre-Christian products of Jewish literature there is as yet no trace of these ideas to be found. Cremer, in the "Wörterbuch der Neutestamentl. Graecität," gives Tob. 14[5] as the solitary instance of this conception to be found in the Apocrypha. Cod. Vat. has in the verse in question καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος, Alex. εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος, Sin. ὁ χρόνος τῶν καιρῶν, Itala "tempus maledictionum," while the Hebr. and Aram. texts present no equivalent. The original reading is therefore uncertain in this case; and, further, ὁ αἰών by itself does not necessarily presuppose an antithesis of two epochs. Even in Sir. 18[10] ἐν ἡμέρᾳ αἰῶνος

means no more than "during one's lifetime," although the translator into Syrian here makes a distinction between עלמא הנא, "this age," and עלמא דזדיקא, "the age of the pious." Moreover, the whole verse is an interpolation foreign to the original document of the son of Sirach. The same holds of "sæculum" in relation to "ævum sanctum"[1] in the Latin version, 17^{25} 24^{33}.[2] The Ethiopic Book of Enoch speaks of the "future age" only once, 71^{15}, and of "this unrighteous age,"[3] 48^{7}, both late additions. The Assumptio Mosis and the Book of Jubilees never mention either idea. The Apocalypse of Baruch, in its older sections, takes no notice of these ideas. They are first mentioned in the more recent elements, belonging to the period after the destruction of Jerusalem. The "age that is promised" to the pious (Syr.[4] עלמא דמלכת להון) appears there, contrasted with "this age" (Syr. עלמא הנא), 14^{13}; "the age to come" (Syr. עלמא דעתיד, דאתי) appears alongside of "this age," 15^{7} 44^{15}; "that endless age" (Syr. עלמא הו דסוף לית לה) beside "this passing age" (Syr. הנא עלמא דעבר),[5] 48^{50}, cf. 40^{3};[6] see also "the new age" (Syr. עלמא חדתא), 44^{12}; "the deathless age" (Syr. עלמא דלא מאית), 31^{3}. "Æon" is further used as a time-concept in 16^{1} $44^{11ff.}$ 51^{8}.[7] In 2 Esd.[8] 7^{50}, cf. 8^{1}, it is said that God has made, not one world, but two. In that book are found the expressions

[1] Cf. Barn. 10^{11} *ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ—τὸν ἅγιον αἰῶνα.*

[2] See *A. Schlatter*, Das neugefundene hebr. Stück des Sirach. Der Glossator des griechischen Sirach (1897), 145, 147 f.

[3] Cf. עָלַם דְּשֶׁקֶר, Vay. R. 26; *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστὼς πονηρός*, Gal. 1^{4}; *ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, Jas. 3^{5}.

[4] According to the Syriac version published by *A. M. Ceriani* in the Monumenta sacra et profana, v. 2.

[5] Cf. עָלַם עֲבִיר (to be read thus, instead of עביר ע'), Jerus. I. Gen. 38^{25}.

[6] That 40^{3} does not belong to the older sections of Bar. Apoc., I have maintained against R. H. Charles in a review of his edition of Baruch, Theol. Litbl. xviii. (1897), No. 15.

[7] Cf. also Bar. Apoc. 42^{13} "These are they who will inherit the time which was spoken of, and whose is the earth in the age that is promised," with 42^{15} "to them is given the age to come."

[8] Edition of the Latin version by *R. L. Bensly* and *M. R. James* (1895), of the Syriac version by *A. M. Ceriani* in Mon. sacr. et prof. v. 1.

"hoc (præsens) sæculum" (Syr. עלמא הנא), "futurum sæculum" (Syr. עלמא דעתיד), $4^{2.\ 27}$ 6^{9} $7^{12.\ 47.\ 112}$ $8^{1f.}$; "hoc tempus," "futurum tempus" (Syr. עלמא הנא, עלמא דעתיד), 7^{113} 8^{52} (cf. Bar. Apoc. 44^{11-13}). The Slavonic Enoch also mentions "the future age," according to Morfill's translation,[1] 56^{4} and 61^{2}, though the text does not seem to be certain in these passages.

The Targum of Onkelos makes no use whatever of the ideas "this age," "the future age."[2] Even in the Targum to the prophets they are infrequent. There are found בְּעָלְמָא דֵּין, 2 Sam. 22^{28}, 1 Kings 5^{13}, Mal. 3^{6}; לְעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, 2 Sam. 7^{19} 23^{5}, Jer. 50^{39}; דְּמִשְׁתֵּיזְבָא[3] בְּעָלְמָא, 1 Kings 5^{13}; בְּעָלְמָא דַּעֲתִיד לְמֵיתֵי, 2 Sam. 22^{28}.

If the addition to a saying of Hillel, given in Ab. ii. 7, be genuine, then Hillel would be the earliest witness for the use of the expressions. The passage runs: "He who acquires for himself the words of the law, acquires for himself the life of the age to come (קָנָה לוֹ חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא)."[4] A second witness is next found in Yokhanan ben Zakkai[5] (fl. *c.* 80 A.D.), who declared that God had revealed to Abraham "this age" (הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה), but not "the age to come" (הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא). A third example may be taken from Eleazar of Modiim, who lived slightly later, who enumerates among the six good gifts received by Israel, "the age to come" (עוֹלָם הַבָּא), and "the new world" (עוֹלָם חָדָשׁ).[6] See also the saying of Eleazar ben Zadoḳ given on p. 121, and the prayer of Nekhonya ben ha-Kanna, j. Ber. 7^{d}.

There is no value in the notice (Ber. ix. 5; Tos. Ber. vii. 21) to the effect that in the temple no more than עַד הָעוֹלָם[7] used to be pronounced in the benedictions, until the

[1] *W. R. Morfill* and *R. H. Charles*, The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (1896).

[2] See, however, Fundamental Ideas, III.

[3] This is the reading of the Venice edition of 1517, and Cod. Reuchl. without insertion of דְּאָתֵי, which appears in the Venice edition of 1525.

[4] The saying is found also without mention of its author, Vay. R. 34.

[5] Ber. R. 44; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 36.

[6] Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 50^{b} on Ex. 16^{25}; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 202.

[7] So it should be read as in Tosephta. מִן הָעוֹלָם would be meaningless.

longer formula, מִן הָעוֹלָם וְעַד הָעוֹלָם, was instituted to combat the sectaries who acknowledged one single æon only. This longer form is already found in Neh. 9^{5}, 1 Chron. 16^{36}, Ps. 41^{14} 106^{48}; the shorter, לְעוֹלָם, Ps. 72^{19} 89^{53}. Such a tradition merely suggests a historical sequence for the two formulæ. Carried out in practice, the prescription would have had no result. He who did not think on "the future age" when the shorter form was used, would not do so even with the longer form.

The currency of the expressions "this age," "the future age," is at all events established by the end of the first Christian century. This reservation should probably be made, that for that period the expressions characterised the language of the learned rather than that of the people. As for the sense imputed to the terms, J. H. Holtzmann[1] says: "The earlier representation simply makes the world to come to coincide with the 'days of the Messiah,' or at least to be inaugurated by that period (Dan., the 'Similitudes' of Enoch, Ps. Sol., Targum, and Mishna); a later view, on the other hand, reckons those Messianic days as part of the present world, and in this way distinguishes them from the final world-renovation (2 Esdras and Apoc. Bar., Midrash and later Theology)." But this hardly represents the true state of the case. Both "the days of the Messiah" and "the future age" are terms unfamiliar in the earlier period. When, subsequently, the world-renovation was located, not before, but after the Messianic epoch, there arose the controversy whether the phrase הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, which meantime had come into use, should be made to include the Messianic age or not. The Targum in this regard represents the former view, it is true, but in the Mishna, Talmud, and Midrash the expression everywhere definitely implies no more than that the time of salvation is set forth as one sharply marked off from the present. Any fuller significance always requires

[1] Lehrb. der Neutestamentl. Theologie, i. 80.

to be ascertained with special reference to each statement and document.

The origin of the expression cannot be explained, as by von Orelli,[1] on the supposition that the idea of different ages was derived from the plural עוֹלָמִים, which originally was intended merely to enhance the idea, and that thus it came to pass that עוֹלָם was used to designate the now current age. This explanation is too ingenious to be considered probable. And the Old Testament בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים has not even indirectly served as a connecting link, for the Targums reproduce it by בְּסוֹף יוֹמַיָּא; see Gen. 49[1], Num. 24[14], Deut. 31[29], Isa. 2[2]. Reference could be made with better reason to the rendering given in the Targum for יוֹם יְהוָה, viz. יוֹמָא דְּעָתִיד לְמֵיתֵי מִן קֳדָם יְיָ, "the day destined to come from God"; see Isa. 2[12], Amos 5[18], Joel 1[15], Zeph. 1[7. 14], Mal. 3[23]: for the comprehensive idea of יוֹם יְהוָה is the real historical precursor of the idea of "the future age." The differentiating cause must probably have been that, during the development of a doctrine regarding the substance of the prophetic promises, comprehensive terms were a necessity for the instruction of the people. In these circumstances nothing was easier than to set in contrast the imperfect present with the perfect future. Further, to express "future," there were available the terms דְּאָתֵי, "that which is coming," or דְּעָתִיד לְמֵיתֵי, "that which is destined to come." For these, see Hebr. הֶעָתִיד לָבוֹא, "the future," Ber. ix. 4; Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 37[a]; Siphre, ed. Friedm. 140[b]; j. Shebi. 35[a]; also merely הַבָּא, j. Shebi. 35[d]; Samaritan, דְּאָתֵי, Commentary of Marka;[2] Aram. מָה דְּעָתִיד לְמֵיתֵי Targ. Eccl. 3[11]. Further, as a matter of fact, the Hebr. לֶעָתִיד לָבוֹא became in Palestine a favourite expression for the Messianic future; for examples see pp. 108, 116, 127, 153.

Contact with Greek modes of thought, moreover, introduced the idea of the *aiôn*, *i.e.* "lifetime," "the age," and

[1] Die hebr. Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit, 80 ff.

[2] *Heidenheim*, Bibliotheca Samaritana, iii. 69[b].

"the temporary," into the circle of Jewish thought, either directly or through the medium of the Syrians. And when a term corresponding to *αἰών* was wanted, it would be readily remembered that the Aramaic לְעָלַם was equivalent to the Greek *εἰς αἰῶνα*, "for ever," and thence easy to attribute to this עָלַם the special meanings of the Greek *αἰών*. Thus עָלַם became "age"; and it cannot excite surprise that Jewish scholarship adopted it as a most convenient designation for comprising "future" and "present."

To illustrate the new use of עָלַם (Hebr. עוֹלָם) as occasioned by the Greek *αἰών*, reference can be made to b. Ber. 17[a] עוֹלָמְךָ תִּרְאֶה בְּחַיֶּיךָ, "mayest thou enjoy thine age during thy lifetime"; Vay. R. 32: יָצָא מֵעוֹלָמוֹ, "he departed from his generation"; b. Yeb. 63[b] (ascribed to Ben Sira) נִמְצָא מְצַטְעֵר עַל עוֹלָם שֶׁאֵין לוֹ, "he is found encumbering himself for the sake of an age which does not belong to him"; Koh. R. 1[3] שִׁבְעָה עוֹלָמוֹת, "seven generations" (of men), and עוֹלְמֵי הַשָּׁנָה, "the seasons of the year," in the Samaritan Marka.[1]

Beyond question the idea of the *κόσμος*, which was afterwards combined with עָלַם, in many respects displaced the idea of the *αἰών*. But this does not apply so early as the time of Jesus, though Paul in 1 Cor. uses *ὁ κόσμος οὗτος* in juxtaposition with *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*.[2] Thus in the discourses of Jesus the rendering of *αἰών* by "world" should be avoided, because that term usually suggests the locus of all created things, or else the creation in its entire extent.

A point to be noted in the use of the word is that Aram. and Hebr. constantly have בְּעָלְמָא הָדֵין, בָּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, "in this age," but almost always "for the age to come," with לְעָלְמָא דְאָתֵי—לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, just as it is also said לֶעָתִיד לָבוֹא, "in the future."

[1] *M. Heidenheim*, Bibliotheca Samaritana, iii. p. xxii. For "age," Marka further uses readily דָּר, properly, "generation"; see loc. cit. 67[a] f.

[2] See above, p. 148. Even in Greek *αἰών* sometimes denotes that which constitutes the contents of transitory time; see Heb. 1^2 11^3, which represent God as having made the *αἰῶνες*; and cf. 2^5 *τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν*, with 6^5 *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*.

Here also it is evident that עָלַם in these phrases is a time-concept. Examples for the Aramaic usage: Targ. Lam. 3^{28}; Eccl. 1^{3} $7^{11f.\ 15}$ 8^{14} 9^{6}; j. Schebi. 35^{c}; j. Taan. 66^{c}; j. Meg. 72^{b}; b. Kidd. 81^{a}; b. Ab. z. 65^{a}: for the Hebrew usage, Ab. vi. 4, 9; for לָעָתִיד לָבוֹא, j. Sanh. 28^{c}; Ruth R. 3^{1}; b. Bab. m. 85^{b}. For the uncommon בְּעָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי, see Targ. Eccl. $5^{9.\ 10}$; j. Dem. 22^{a}.

Both *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων* and *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος* have their counterpart in עָלְמָא דְּאָתֵי. And *ὁ αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος* also finds its equivalent in עָלְמָא הָהוּא, Targ. Eccl. 6^{9} 7^{14}.

On the expression *καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν*, see above, p. 119 f.; for *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, see p. 115.

3. THE SIMPLE *ὁ αἰών*.

In the phrase *ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*, Matt. 13^{22}, *ὁ αἰών* denotes "that which is temporal," without implying that the term is a contraction for *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*. Even if it were desired to supply *τούτου* as in some texts, then the antithesis between the current epoch and a future period of a different character would in this passage be needlessly introduced. Cognate Jewish phrases are: מִלֵּי דְעָלְמָא, "affairs of this life," b. Pes. 113^{a}; b. Sabb. 82^{a};[1] עִסְקֵי דְעָלְמָא הָדֵין, "the concerns of this age," Targ. Eccl. 7^{18}; מִלֵּי דִידֵיהּ, "his own concerns," in contrast with מִלֵּי דִשְׁמַיָּא, "the things of God," b. Ber. 7^{b}; b. Meg. 6^{b};[2] חֻפְצֵי שָׁמַיִם, b. Sabb. 113^{a}, 114^{a}. According to j. Ber. 11^{a}, food has relation to the "transitory life" (חַיֵּי שָׁעָה),[3] but the study of the law has relation to "the ever-enduring life" (חַיֵּי עַד לֹא כְשָׁעָה). To gain the "transitory life" (חַיֵּי שָׁעָה) is placed alongside of the gaining of "the life of the world to

[1] b. Sabb. 82^{a} expresses blame that any one should call the "life of men" (חַיֵּי דְבַרְיָתָא) the same thing as occupation with מִלֵּי דְעָלְמָא. Palestinian parallels to this expression are wanting.

[2] Cf. *μεριμνᾶν τὰ τοῦ κόσμου* (in apposition with *τὰ τοῦ κυρίου*), 1 Cor. 7^{34}.

[3] חַיֵּי שָׁעָה means, Vay. R. 32, in an Aramaic passage "maintenance." b. Yom. 85^{a} it has the literal meaning of the words: "the life of an hour," *i.e.* a brief interval; cf. Jerus. I. Gen. 49^{18} פֻּרְקָן דְּשַׁעְתָּא, "a temporary redemption."

come" (חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא), Vay. R. 34. See also p. 157. Whether "anxiety" should really be rendered by the Targumic יְצָפָא may be left undecided. In Sir. 42[9] anxiety on behalf of the daughter (*ἡ μέριμνα αὐτῆς*) is expressed in Hebr. דַּאֲגָתָהּ, Syr. צפתה, which tends to support the rendering by יְצָפָא. Still יְצָפָא דְעָלְמָא appears suspicious; טָרְחוּתָא דְחַיֵּיהוֹן, "the troubles of their life," might perhaps be the right phrase.

ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος occurs in Matt. 13[39f. 49] 1 28[20] without parallel in Mark and Luke. The same phrase in Matt. 24[3] is replaced in Mark 13[4] by *ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα*, and in Luke 21[7] by *ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι* (cf. v.[36]). The theme in the context is the conclusion of the current world-epoch. Hence *ὁ αἰών* is here also no abbreviation for *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, but a designation of time as transitory, of the world's course. As the term occurs only in Matthew, it will belong not to Jesus Himself, but to the evangelist, who has it in common with the Hellenistic author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (9[26]): *ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων*. Paul also writes, 1 Cor. 10[11] *τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*. There is here a close relationship with *τὸ τέλος*, Matt. 24[6. 14] (Mark 13[7], Luke 21[9]); cf. *εἰς τέλος*, Matt. 10[22] 24[13] (Mark 13[13]). This rests again upon the Hebr. עַד עֵת קֵץ, LXX *ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας*, Dan. 12[4]; לְקֵץ הַיָּמִים, LXX *εἰς συντέλειαν ἡμερῶν*, 12[13]; Aram. עַד סוֹפָא, LXX *ἕως τέλους*, Dan. 7[26].[2] One might therefore with some probability refer *ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* as expressed by Jesus to the simple סוֹפָא. Nevertheless the phrase in Matthew has also its Jewish parallels; see "exitus sæculi," Ass. Mosis 12[4]; "the end of the age" (Syr. שולמה דעלמא), Bar. Apoc. 54[21] 69[4] 83[7]; "the end of the ages" (Syr. שולמהון דעלמא), loc. cit. 59[8]; "finis temporis hujus" (Syr. שולמה דהנא עלמא), 2 Esd. 7[113]; סוֹף עָלְמָא, Targ. 2 Sam. 23[1]. See also Bar. Apoc. 27[15] שולמא דזבנא, "completion of

[1] Matt. 13[39] without the article, v.[49] according to some MSS. with *τούτου*.

[2] Cf. also in OT. בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, for which the Targums have בְּסוֹף יוֹמַיָּא; see above, p. 152.

the times," cf. 29^8 30^3; Ass. Mosis 1^{18} "in consummatione exitus dierum."

III. ETERNAL LIFE, LIFE.

1. ITS POSITION IN THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

ζωὴ αἰώνιος (always without the article) is spoken of by Jesus as the possession in which the righteous will one day have part, while the godless are subject to perdition.

ζωὴ αἰώνιος is the object of *κληρονομεῖν*, Matt. 19^{29} (where Mark 10^{30} has *λαμβάνειν*, Luke 18^{30} *ἀπολαμβάνειν*), as also in the question addressed to Jesus, Mark 10^{17} (Luke 18^{18}, cf. 10^{25}), where Matt. 19^{16} has *ἔχειν*. In these cases *ζ. α.* is regarded as a possession. It is a certain status, when mention is made of an "attaining to" it, Matt. 25^{46} (*ἀπέρχεσθαι εἰς ζ. α.*). This status is also on several occasions referred to as merely *ἡ ζωή* (this always with the article). Again, in Matt. 7^{14} *ἡ ζωή* is anticipated by *ἡ ἀπώλεια* in the previous verse (Luke 13^{24} contains neither). "Ways" lead in this instance to "life" and "destruction." One can "enter into," *εἰσέρχεσθαι*, life *εἰς τὴν ζωήν*, Matt. $18^{8f.}$ (Mark $9^{43.\,45}$). The antithesis to this is "to go away," *ἀπέρχεσθαι*, "into hell" (*εἰς τὴν γέενναν*), Matt. 5^{30}, Mark 9^{43}, or "to be cast into hell" (*βάλλεσθαι*), Matt. $18^{8f.}$ (Mark $9^{45.\,47}$). In Mark 9^{47} there stands in place of *εἰς τὴν ζωήν* the obvious equivalent, *εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*. *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωήν* is found Matt. 19^{17} as a repetition of *ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον*.

2. THE JEWISH USAGE.

The "eternal life" (חַיֵּי עוֹלָם) of the pious is first mentioned in the Book of Daniel (12^2), next during the first

century before Christ in the Psalter of Solomon 3^{16}, cf. 13^{9}; Enoch[1] 37^{4} 40^{9} "to take possession of eternal life," cf. 58^{3} 62^{5f} (see also Slavonic Enoch 65^{10}, cf. 50^{2} "to take possession of the endless life to come"); 2 Macc. 7^{9} (*αἰώνιος ἀναβίωσις ζωῆς*), 7^{26} (*ἀέναος ζωή*); 4 Macc. 15^{3}. The idea has also found admission into the Targum of Onkelos, though it is not spoken of as "the age to come," for חַיֵּי עָלְמָא, Lev. 18^{5}, Deut. 33^{6} (where the Jerus. Targ. incorrectly thinks of the life of this age), is intended for "eternal life." Further, the association with יֵיחֵי בְּחַיֵּי עָלְמָא in the passages adduced and Targ. Ezek. $20^{11.\ 13.\ 21}$, Hos. 14^{10}, makes it clear that חַיֵּי עָלְמָא is there regarded as equivalent to עָלְמָא דְאָתֵי. The Targum to 1 Sam. 2^{6} also says that God will cause a resurrection from the realm of the dead "in the" eternal life (בְּחַיֵּי עָלְמָא), and Jerus. Targ. I. on Deut. 13^{19} straightway changes it in this connection into עָלְמָא דְאָתֵי. See also Targ. 1 Sam. 25^{29}, which tells that the soul of David is hidden before God "in the security of the eternal life" (בִּגְנַז חַיֵּי עָלְמָא), *i.e.* in the safe keeping of those who are destined to life eternal.

Elsewhere throughout the older Jewish literature the term "eternal life" is found almost only in a case where it stands in contrast with "transitory life." Eliezer ben Hyrkanos (*c.* 100 A.D.) speaks reproachfully of such as neglect the eternal life (מַנִּיחִין חַיֵּי עוֹלָם) and "occupy themselves with the transitory life" (עוֹסְקִין בְּחַיֵּי שָׁעָה).[2] The same terms are afterwards imputed also to Simeon ben Yokhai[3] (*c.* 130) and to Simeon ben Gamliel II.[4] (*c.* 160). The school of Shammai (first century) makes use, according to Tos. Sanh. xiii. 3, of חַיֵּי עוֹלָם in a passage containing allusions to Dan. 12^{2}. An appendix to a statement of Yehuda ben Ilai (*c.* 150)[5] contains the words חַיֵּי עוֹלָמִים, Tam. vii. 4. The Aramaic prayer

[1] In Enoch 10^{10} *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is meant merely of a "life without death."
[2] b. Bez. 15^{b}; *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 108 (cf. 62).
[3] b. Sabb. 33^{b}; *Bacher*, op. cit. ii. 89.
[4] j. Mo. k. 82^{b}; *Bacher*, op. cit. ii. 330.
[5] *Bacher*, loc. cit. i. 336.

beginning מְחֵי וּמְמִי says,[1] "he who brings forth out of Sheol into the eternal life" (לְחַיֵּי עָלְמָא), and a similar formula in the Kaddish prayer used after an interment[2] appears in לְאַפָּקָא יְתְהוֹן לְחַיֵּי עָלְמָא, "to raise them (the dead) up to the eternal life."

In general, however, "the life of the world to come," חַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, has taken the place of the shorter "eternal life," חַיֵּי עוֹלָם. Examples of the former, see pp. 103, 118, 125, 150, 155, 160.

3. THE VERBS CONNECTED WITH IT.

As for the combinations in which *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is found, the verb *κληρονομεῖν* is, in Aram., יְרַת or אַחְסַן; see, for these terms, p. 125.[3] *λαμβάνειν* and *ἀπολαμβάνειν*, Mark 10[30], Luke 18[30], are both to be referred to נְסַב. For *ἔχειν*, on the contrary, Matt. 19[16], no equivalent need be sought, since the parallels in Mark and Luke have here, as one would expect, *κληρονομεῖν*. The verb *ἀπέρχεσθαι*, Matt. 25[46], is modified by the adjacent *εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, cf. Matt. 5[30]. Yet אֲזַל is the only word that can be proposed to render it; and to the same verb—to אֱזִילוּ or זִילוּ (Galil. אִזְלוּן), "go ye," the *δεῦτε*, v.[34], addressed to the righteous — must also be referred. Thus it can also be said concerning them, יֵיזְלוּן לְחַיֵּי עָלְמָא, "they go away (from the jndgment) into eternal life." To "attain unto" the eternal life (*εἰσέρχεσθαι*) would, on the other hand, be expressed by אֲתָא לְחַיֵּי עָלְמָא; see above, p. 116 f.

4. THE SIMPLE *ἡ ζωή*.

In the Old Testament the scope of expressions like הַחַיִּים, "the life," Deut. 30[13. 19]; דֶּרֶךְ הַחַיִּים, "the way of life," Jer. 21[8]; אֹרַח חַיִּים, "path of life," Prov. 2[19], does not extend be-

[1] Seder Rab Amram, ii. 21[b].

[2] According to *Baer's* Seder Abodath Yisrael, 588. But the formula is wanting in Seder Rab Amram and in Maimonides.

[3] The "heir" (cf. *κληρόνομοι ζωῆς αἰωνίου*, Tit. 3[7]) would be יָרְתָא. On the "promise" of the life, see above, p. 103.

yond earthly life and well-being. The last-named phrase as used in Ps. 16^{11} already seems to contain the idea of a happy existence after death. At a later date the idea of the life eternal of those risen from the dead attached itself to these verses, so that "life" could be put shortly for "eternal life." Thus the Psalter of Solomon (14^{6}) says of the pious: *κληρονομήσουσιν ζωήν*, and speaks of *ζωή*, 9^{9}, without qualification, meaning thereby, according to 3^{16}, the "eternal life." In 2 Macc. 7^{14} there is also found the abbreviated *ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν* alongside of *εἰς αἰωνίου ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει*, in 7^{9}. The treatise of the "Two Ways,"[1] generally supposed to be of Jewish origin, alone contains the expression "way of life." The Slavonic Enoch (ed. Morfill and Charles) 30^{15} also speaks of these ways. A detailed description of them is given in the Testament of Abraham,[2] not, however, without marked Christian influence, which shows itself in the use of expressions from the Synoptists. Bar. Apoc. 42^{7} represents that "perdition" and "life" one day will claim what pertains to each.

The later Jewish literature has given the preference to the clearer appellation, "life of the age to come." Nevertheless there are found occasionally as correlatives: חַיִּין, "they attain to the (eternal) life," and נְדוֹנִין, "they are judged (pass to eternal punishment)," Tos. Sanh. xiii. 2; b. Sanh. 103^{b}.[3] It is only when "life" and "death" form parts of the same picture that they are always left without qualification. Thus Yokhanan (*c.* 260 A.D.) declares that those who are pious to perfection receive[4] the "Judge's award (*ἀπόφασις*) of life" (אֵיפּוֹפַּסִי שֶׁלַּחַיִּים); and in the prayer

[1] See *A. Harnack*, Die Apostellehre und die jüdischen beiden Wege [2] (1896), 57. As to the Jewish origin of the "Two Ways," I have, however, grave doubts. It could hardly have been intended for the instruction of proselytes.

[2] *M. R. James*, The Testament of Abraham (Texts and Studies, ii. 2), 88 ff., 112 ff.; cf. 51 ff.

[3] Cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Taan. i. 140.

[4] So in j. R. h. S. 57^{a}, while b. R. h. S. 16^{b} speaks of a recording and sealing "unto life," לְחַיִּים.

which begins רַחֲמָנָא אִדְּבַר,[1] it is said דֵּינָא דְחַיֵּי נְזוֹר עֲלַן, "may the award of life be pronounced over us!"[2] The principle that "the medicine which brings life" (סַם הַיִּים) may also be "the poison which brings death" (סַם מִיתָה), is observed first of all by Benaya (*c.* 200 A.D.),[3] and afterwards by others, as Joshua ben Levy (*c.* 240).[4] In the Samaritan author Marka,[5] God refers to Himself as פרנם חייה ואריסה דמותה, "the stay of life, and the poison of death." There should also be added the Pauline expression: *ὀσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, ὀσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν*, 2 Cor. 2^{16}.

It is quite conceivable that the detailed Greek phrase: *ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωήν*, Matt. 7^{14}, may be derived from the simple *ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς*; cf. Aram. אוֹרַח חַיֵּי, Targ. Jer. 21^{8}; אוֹרְחָא דְחַיֵּי, Targ. Jerus. I. Deut. $30^{15.\ 19}$. The Old Testament never contemplates a way as "leading" to some destination. But in post-biblical literature we have Bar. Apoc. 85^{13} "the way of the fire, the path which leads to Gehinnom" (Syr. אורחא דנורא ושביל דמקרב לגהנא); and Ber. R. 9: אֵיזֶה דֶּרֶךְ מְבִיאָה אֶת הָאָדָם לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "which way is it that leads to the life of the age to come?" The Jerus. Gospel in Matt. 7^{14} uses אובל, which is likewise known to the Jewish Aramaic of Palestine. Recourse is thus open to the Aramaic אֵיתֵי or אוֹבֵל, and if need be to קָרֵב. "The way that leads to the life" would in Aramaic be: לְחַיֵּי (דמוֹבְלָה)[7] אוֹרְחָא דְמַיְתֵיהּ.[6]

εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν ζωήν (Matt. 18^{8}, Mark 9^{45}) would be אֲתָא לְחַיֵּי, cf. p. 116, since עַל לְחַיֵּי עָלְמָא, being in the late Targum to the Psalms (40^{8}), should not determine the selection. It may well be asked, however, whether the

[1] Seder Rab Amram, ii. 20[a].

[2] Cf. *δικαίωσις ζωῆς*, Rom. 5^{18}.

[3] Siphre, Deut. 45, ed. Friedm. 82[b]; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Taan. ii. 540.

[4] b. Yoma 72[b]; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. i. 137; see also ibid. pp. 37, 262. The Aramaic form is סָמָּא דְחַיֵּי and סָמָּא דְמוֹתָא, as in b. Yom. 72[b] (Raba).

[5] *Heidenheim*, Bibl. Samarit. iii. 7[a].

[6] אֹרַח in Aramaic is at least generally fem. not masc., as Gesenius-Buhl and the dictionaries of Levy represent.

[7] That חַיֵּי is readily used as the defined form, see above; also Onk. Deut. $30^{15.\ 19}$, where חַיֵּי is put for the Hebrew הַחַיִּים, and Targ. Mal. 2^{5}.

simple ἡ ζωή is original in this connection. Judging from Matt. 19[17], where ἡ ζωή represents ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and Mark 9[47], cf. vv.[43. 45], where ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is used in its place, it is not improbable that as used in the words of Jesus—excepting, perhaps, Matt. 7[13. 14]—it might throughout be represented by חַיֵּי עָלְמָא or כַּלְבוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא.

5. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE IDEA.

With Jesus "eternal life" and "life" form the correlative idea to expressions which denote eternal perdition. The popular Jewish term גֵּיהִנֹּם (Aram. form of גֵּיהִנֹּם), Greek ἡ γέεννα, is the one term whose use by Jesus is assured, since all three Synoptists record it among the words of Jesus. Less certain is τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, based upon Isa. 66[24], as it occurs among the words of Jesus only in Mark 9[43. (45)]. Peculiar to Matthew are: τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον (18[8]), κόλασις αἰώνιος (25[46]), ἡ κάμινος τοῦ πυρός (13[42]),—this being occasioned by the imagery of the parable,—and ἡ ἀπώλεια (7[13]). The last-named is required as antithesis to ἡ ζωή (7[14]), and can therefore be reckoned as certain. Both "eternal life" and "Gehenna" have as necessary presupposition a judgment which awaits all men, in which the fate of men is for ever decided. There is thus involved a symbolism derived from a judicial process. The penalty of death threatens him who has been found guilty at the bar of justice; the gift of life is bestowed on him who is acquitted. In the final judgment, it is not the ending or continuation of earthly existence that constitutes the decisive issue; but either, on the one hand, the penalty of an eternal death by fire, the scene of which is Gehenna, which involves permanent exclusion from the theocracy; or, on the other hand, appointment to the eternal life which is consummated in the theocracy, or, in rabbinical terms, in the age to come. Hence "eternal life" radically means participation in the "theocracy"; and it is substan-

tially the same thing whether it be the entrance into the theocracy or into eternal life that is spoken of. The forgiveness of sins should not be regarded, as by Holtzmann,[1] as "the negative counterpart of the beatitude (of the kingdom of God), the primary foretaste of the positive possession of life"; it is rather the indispensable condition for entrance into "life," but not a constituent element of the life itself. Nor is there any call for peculiar speculations in regard to the conception of "the life," as being, according to Haupt's definition[2] of *ἡ ζωή*, "the sum-total of all that constitutes life in its fullest sense,—the true life." The difference between the preaching of Jesus and Jewish views consists not in the idea of the "life," but in what Jesus has to say of the theocracy, and of that righteousness without which life in the theocracy can never be attained.

IV. THE WORLD.

1. BOOKS IN WHICH THE TERM IS STILL UNKNOWN.

Old Testament Hebrew has no term which would quite correspond to the Greek *ὁ κόσμος*. The *Alexandrian Version* of the biblical books renders the "host" of heaven (צְבָא) by *ὁ κόσμος* in the Pentateuch, Gen. 2^{1}, Deut. 4^{19} 17^{3}. This Greek usage, which belongs to an earlier period, is also adopted by the LXX in Isa. 24^{21}, elsewhere they use *κόσμος* merely for "ornament." The Book of Daniel still has כָּל אַרְעָא, where a term for world might be expected, Dan. $2^{35.\,39}$ 3^{31} $4^{8.\,19}$ (without כָּל) 6^{26}. The Book of Sirach has *κόσμος*, 43^{9}, for the Hebr. עֲדִי, "ornament," and 50^{19}, probably for תִּפְאֶרֶת, with the same meaning;[3] and *αἰών* occurs 43^{6} 46^{19},[4]

[1] Lehrb. d. Neutest. Theol. i. 202.

[2] *E. Haupt*, Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu, 85.

[3] So *S. Schechter* conjectures, Jew. Quart. Rev. x. 206. The MS. Hebrew Text published by Schechter has לְשָׁרֵת מִזְבֵּחַ, "to serve the altar."

[4] Here without equivalent in the Hebrew text.

for עוֹלָם, "eternity."[1] In the Syriac version *κτίσμα αἰῶνος* also appears 38^{34} as עבידתא דעלמא, but can scarcely be correct. The original might probably have here used עוֹלָם adverbially to mean "always."[2] In 39^{2} *ἀνδρῶν ὀνομαστῶν* (Syr. אנשא דעלמא) apparently reproduces אַנְשֵׁי עוֹלָם, "the men of olden time"; cf. אֲבוֹת עוֹלָם, 44^{1}, or even אַנְשֵׁי שֵׁם, also occurring in 44^{3}. And just as עוֹלָם, in the sense of world, is absent from the original of the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, so it is not to be found in 1 Macc., Ps. of Solomon, nor in the Books of Tobit and Judith. No importance need be attached to the saying attributed to Simeon the Just (*c.* 280 B.C.) concerning the three things on which "the world" (הָעוֹלָם) rests.[3] The substance and the form of the expression are equally unfavourable to its authenticity.

Nor, again, did the first[4] section of the *Book of Enoch* (chaps. 1–36), the original of which was probably in Hebrew,[5] contain עוֹלָם, in the sense of world. The terms of the Greek version: *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος*, 1^{3}; *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων*, 12^{3}; *κύριε ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης κυριεύων τοῦ αἰῶνος*, 22^{14}; *ὁ κύριος τῶν αἰώνων*, 9^{4}; *ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ αἰῶνος*, $25^{3.5.7}$ 27^{3}, cannot be dissociated from the biblical expressions: אֵל עוֹלָם, Gen. 21^{33}; אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם, Isa. 40^{28}; צוּר עוֹלָמִים, Isa. 26^{4}; מֶלֶךְ עוֹלָם, Jer. 10^{10} (Targ. Venice 1517, מֶלֶךְ עָלַם; Venice 1525, Cod. Reuchl. מֶלֶךְ עָלְמִין); מַלְכוּת כָּל עוֹלָמִים, Ps. 145^{13}. In any case it may be assumed that the Hebrew original, from which the Greek version was made, everywhere employed the article, *i.e.* had מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, אֱלֹהֵי הָעוֹלָם. But the article, of course, may

[1] In additions to the Book of Sirach there occur *κόσμος*, "world," 16^{18} 18^{1}; *κτίσις*, 16^{14} 24^{8}, on which see *A. Schlatter*, Das neugefundene hebr. Stück des Sirach. Der Glossator des griech. Sirach (1897), 133, 136, 140 f.

[2] Cf. Ps. 61^{8}.

[3] Aboth i. 2.

[4] The first part of the Book of Enoch can scarcely be the oldest, and at least it cannot have originated at the beginning of the second century B.C., as R. H. Charles holds. The divine names *θεός*, *βασιλεύς*, *κύριος*, *τοῦ αἰῶνος*, *τῶν αἰώνων*, currently used by the author, are scarcely in keeping with so early a date.

[5] The decisive proof lies in the Hebrew words contained in the Greek version; see *R. H. Charles*, The Book of Enoch, 325; *A. Lods*, Le livre d'Hénoch, lvi ff.

merely be intended to render the general conception more definite. It is not impossible that the article coupled with עוֹלָם in composite expressions, gives the sense of "eternal." It occurs Dan. 12[7], Hebr. חֵי הָעוֹלָם; Dan. 4[31], Aram. חֵי עָלְמָא, meaning: "He that liveth eternally"; Onk. Lev. 18[5] חַיֵּי עָלְמָא, "the eternal life"; Gen. 9[12] לְדָרֵי עָלְמָא, "for perpetual generations"; Palmyr. בת עלמא, "the eternal house" (grave), de Vogüé, 32, 34 (Galil. בֵּית עָלַם, "cemetery," Vay. R. 12); Palmyr. לְעָלְמָא, "for ever," de Vogüé, 21, 23; and also לְעָלְמָא, Targ. Isa. 28[28]; עַד עָלְמָא, "for evermore," Onk. Gen. 13[15], cf. Dan. 2[20]; but elsewhere always undefined לְעָלַם, "for ever," *e.g.* Onk. Deut. 15[17]; לְעָלְמִין, Dan. 5[10], Targ. Isa. 25[8].

Still, it is perhaps more probable that עוֹלָם when united with the article in the Book of Enoch does not merely represent the adjective "eternal." מֶלֶךְ עוֹלָם means "eternal King"; מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם is "the King who as ruler controls the immeasurable duration of the world." The Greek translator by his choice of *αἰών* in preference to *κόσμος*, shows he too was conscious of a time-concept. Thus הָעוֹלָם in this section of the Book of Enoch has the same sense as it bears in Eccl. 3[11], where the second half of the verse makes it clear that the idea in view is the incomprehensible range of time—the consideration of which God has imposed upon the heart of man, despite man's impotence to survey completely the works of God therein comprised.—With *ὁ αἰῶν ὁ μέγας*, Enoch 16[1], little indeed can be done. The Greek text for that passage is doubtless in confusion. Perhaps עַד יוֹם סוֹף הָעוֹלָם הַגָּדוֹל stood in the original, and הַגָּדוֹל by mistake was taken with הָעוֹלָם; or else the variants: עַד יוֹם הַדִּין הַגָּדוֹל and עַד סוֹף הָעוֹלָם, were blended with each other. Since, however, the context contemplates in any case an end of the עוֹלָם, it is evident that the author did not regard עוֹלָם as signifying an entirely unlimited range of time.

He can thus have in view the world-epoch extending from the creation to the judgment, and עוֹלָם, in that case, is

differentiated from the idea of the "world" solely by its temporal element. But he may also, disregarding the "end," give prominence to the infiniteness of the עוֹלָם; and this he does intentionally, especially where the plural is used. מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָמִים is "the King of the endless succession of ages," though, of course, even מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם is not "the King of the world," but He who controls infinite time. There is, then, no great difference between the "God of the collective ages" and "the eternal God"; cf. Ass. Mos. 10^{7} "deus æternus"; 1 Tim. 1^{17} *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων*; Susanna LXX ^{35}, Theod. ^{42}, *ὁ θεὸς ὁ αἰώνιος*; Rom. 16^{26} *ὁ αἰώνιος θεός*.

Here may also be named certain expressions which contain עוֹלָם in the plural: רִבּוֹן הָעוֹלָמִים, "the Lord of the ages," b. Yom. 87^{b} (Yokhanan, *c.* 260); the liturgical phrase רִבּוֹן כָּל הָעוֹלָמִים, "Lord of all the ages," Seder Rab Amram, i. 2^{a}, 12^{a}, 27^{a}; צוּר הָעוֹלָמִים, "Rock of the ages," ibid. 3^{b}; תַּקִּיף עָלְמַיָּא, "the Strong One of the ages," Targ. Isa. 26^{4}; מֶלֶךְ עָלְמַיָּא, "the King of the Ages," Targ. Isa. 6^{5} 30^{33}, Ezek. 1^{24}, Zech. 14^{16}.

Of a similar nature are the expressions: *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος*, Enoch 9^{4} (beside *εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας*), $10^{3.\ 22}$ (*εἰς πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος*), 14^{5} 15^{6}; cf. Gen. 9^{12} לְדֹרֹת עוֹלָם; Onk. לְדָרֵי עָלְמָא; Targ. Eccl. 7^{29} כָּל דָּרֵי עָלְמָא; Eph. 3^{21} *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*. All the generations of "the world" are not here meant, but all the generations of "the current age" of the "world-period." In Enoch 9^{6}, according to the correct text, *τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, which are preserved in heaven, must signify "the mysteries of primæval time"; cf. *μυστήριον χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένον*, Rom. 16^{25}.

The Greek version of Enoch has also used *ὁ κόσμος*, $20^{2.\ 4}$. There, however, it is the host of the stars that is in consideration, so that *κόσμος* will be derived from צְבָא; cf. p. 162.

The section of Enoch called the Book of Similitudes, chaps. 37–71, the date of which is uncertain, mentions the

"creation of the world" only in later additions, 48^{6} $69^{16.\ 17.\ 18}$ 71^{15}. Further, $48^{6.\ 7}$ must be considered an interpolation, because (1) it disturbs the connection between vv. [5] and [8], (2) v.[6] merely repeats with variations the substance of v.[3], and (3) v.[7] contains terms which suggest affinity with those of the late addition in $108^{8.\ 9.\ 10}$.

The section, chaps. 83–90, containing the Book of Visions, contains the phrase "God of the whole world," 84^{2}. It occurs in a very ornate doxology which belongs to the introduction to the Visions, and this part may very likely have been more recent than the Visions themselves.

For the other sections of Enoch, see, further, under 3.

From this review it appears that the use of עָלַם or עוֹלָם for "world" in pre-Christian times must at least be gravely doubted. It is also obviously improbable that the use of *κόσμος* for world, which even among the Greeks did not originate early, should have prematurely modified the phraseology of the Syrians and the Jews.

2. THE IDEA OF THE "WORLD" IN THE SYNOPTISTS.

Jesus says: *τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου*, Matt. 5^{14}, in proximity with *τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς*, v.[13]; but the cognate passages, Luke 11^{33}, Mark 4^{21} (Luke 8^{16}), have no corresponding term. Still the phrase in the account of the Temptation: *πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου*, Matt. 4^{8} (Luke 4^{5} *π. τ. β. τῆς οἰκουμένης*), may be brought into comparison; and in it *κόσμος* could easily be referred to אַרְעָא, "the earth"; cf. Targ. Jer. 34^{1} כָּל מַלְכוּת אַרְעָא. All the Synoptists have *κερδαίνειν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον*, Matt. 16^{26} (Mark 8^{36}, Luke 9^{25}). In Matt. 18^{7} occurs *οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ*, but the parallel in Luke 17^{1} omits *τῷ κόσμῳ*. The gospel will be preached *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ*, Matt. 26^{13} (Mark 14^{9} *εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*), *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*, Matt. 24^{14} (Mark 13^{10} *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*; cf. Luke 24^{47}); see also *πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα*—

πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, Mark 16^{15}, and *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, Matt. 28^{19}. The field in the parable, Matt. 13^{38}, is the world (Epiphanius: *ὁ κόσμος οὗτος*), but the interpretation is not given in Mark 4 and Luke 8. Luke 12^{30} speaks of *τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου*, but Matt. 6^{32} has only *τὰ ἔθνη*. The world over which the signs of the end come is called *ἡ οἰκουμένη*, Luke 21^{26}, but no parallels appear in Matt. $24^{29ff.}$ or Mark $13^{24ff.}$. Lastly, there occur also the expressions: *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, Matt. 25^{34}, Luke 11^{50} (but not in Matt. 23^{35}); *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου*, Matt. 24^{21} (Mark 13^{19} *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως*), *ἀπὸ* (*δὲ*) *ἀρχῆς κτίσεως*, Mark 10^{6} (Matt. $19^{4.8}$ only *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*).

In this it is surprising that Matthew alone uses *ὁ κόσμος* with any frequency, its appearance in Mark and Luke being only intermittent. The only expressions common to all the Synoptists are *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς* (*ἀρχῆς*) *κόσμου* (*κτίσεως*), and *κερδαίνειν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον*. As for the first, the citation from Scripture in Matt. 13^{35} refers it to Ps. 78^{2}, where the LXX puts *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* for the Hebr. מִנִּי קֶדֶם. Thus it would be just the favourite term of the Targ. of Onkelos מִלְּקַדְמִין, "in former times"; see Gen. 2^{8} 3^{15}, Deut. 2^{12} 33^{27}.[1] As for *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, Matt. 19^{8}, it may reproduce בְּקַדְמֵיתָא or מִן קַדְמֵיתָא. For the former, see Onk. Gen. 13^{3}; for the latter, j. Kidd. 64^{c}.

Hence there appears to be some degree of certainty that Jesus employed the term עָלַם in the sense of *κόσμος* only in the one instance, *κερδαίνειν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον*.

In the case of "gaining" the whole world, as in that of "losing" one's soul, there is involved a metaphor drawn from commercial dealings. This consideration will determine the Aramaic words to be presupposed. For "gain" and "loss" the Mishna uses שָׂכָר and הֶפְסֵד, Ab. ii. 1, v. 11; Bab. m. v. 4; cf. j. Bab. m. 10^{c}. In Aramaic "gain" is אֲגַר, j. Bab. m. 8^{c} 10^{b}. To "make profit" and to "suffer loss" are Hebr.

[1] Cf. Targ. Isa. 41^{4} where מֵרֹאשׁ is rendered by מִלְּקַדְמִין. Of course מִן עָלְמָא is also possible.

נִשְׂכַּר and נִפְסַד, b. Pes. 50[b] (Baraitha); but also הִשְׂתַּכֵּר and הִתְחַסֵּר, Vay. R. 34. In Ber. i. 2 to "suffer loss" is הִפְסִיד. In Aramaic the equivalent of the last is אַפְסֵיד, j. Ned. 38[d], while the Peal פְּסַד, as it seems, j. Keth. 30[d], means "to end in ruin." A verb for "to gain" other than אַרְוַח, j. Ned. 39[b], is not known to me; and this verb does not properly admit of taking an object with it. Hence there may be put[1] for Matt. 16[26] וּמָה[2] מַהֲנֵי לֶאֱנָשָׁא אִין הֲוָה לֵיהּ אֲגַר כָּל עָלְמָא וְאַפְסֵיד נַפְשֵׁיהּ.

The Palestinian proverb, b. Ned. 41[a], applied to knowledge (דֵּעָה), has some resemblance: דְּדָא בֵיהּ כֻּלָּה בֵיהּ דְּלָא דָא בֵיהּ מָה בֵיהּ דָּא קָנֵי מָה חָסַר דָּא לָא קָנֵי מָה קָנֵי, "he in whom it (knowledge) resides has everything: he in whom it does not reside, what (after all) has he? this attained, what more is lacking? if he has not attained this, what (after all) has he attained?" Here we have the antitheses "to possess" and "not to possess," "to acquire" and to "fail to acquire," but they do not admit of being transferred to the saying of our Lord. Still the common correlatives "to gain" and "to lose" may quite well be inserted without injury to the sense. For these, Aramaic offers קְנָא and אוֹבֵד, and the saying of Christ would be: וּמָה מַהֲנֵי לֶאֱנָשָׁא אִין קְנָא כָּל עָלְמָא וְאוֹבֵד נַפְשֵׁיהּ. With אוֹבֵד נַפְשֵׁיהּ may be compared Ab. ii. 35[3] R. Nathan: "Every one who keeps a precept of the Law, keeps his own soul (נַפְשׁוֹ הוּא מְשַׁמֵּר); and every one who destroys one precept of the Law, destroys his own soul (נַפְשׁוֹ הוּא מְאַבֵּד)."

The "whole world" is similarly referred to as a possession in the dictum of Meïr (*c.* 160 A.D.):[4] "When man comes into the world, his hands are folded together as if he would say, 'The whole world is mine, and I take possession of it'" (כָּל הָעוֹלָם כֻּלּוֹ שֶׁלִּי הוּא וַאֲנִי נוֹחֲלוֹ). On the other hand,

[1] Jerus. Gospel has, Mark 8[36] Vat.: מא גר מתהני ברנש אן יתגר כולה עלמא ונפשיה יכסר (read יחסר).

[2] Cf. Vay. R. 20: אִם הָדֵין דּוּחֲקָא מְעוֹרַב מָה חֶדְוְתָא מַהְנְיָא, "If the laughter is not unqualified, what good is there in merriment?"

[3] Ed. *Schechter*, 39[a].

[4] Koh. R. 5[14]; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 19.

עוֹלָם is understood to denote "age" in the statement of Simeon ben Shetach (*c.* 80 B.C.), who maintained[1] that the praise of the God of the Jews (on the part of heathen who esteemed the integrity of Simeon) was dearer to him than "the gain of this whole age" (מֵאֲנַר כָּל חֲדֵין עָלְמָא).

Of course the possibility also exists of setting aside even this solitary instance in the words of Jesus of the use of עָלַם = *κόσμος*. That might be done either by taking עָלְמָא in the sense of "transitory time," or else by substituting terms such as כָּל אַרְעָא, "the whole earth"; שְׁמַיָּא וְאַרְעָא, "heaven and earth."

3. INSTANCES OF THE USE OF THE IDEA "WORLD."

It is not surprising that Hellenistic compositions, such as 2 Macc. (5 times), 4 Macc. (4 times), Wisdom (19 times), should use the conception and the term *ὁ κόσμος*. Among the New Testament writers, the extensive use of *ὁ κόσμος* by John in the Gospel and Epistles is specially worthy of note—a use which forms an essential part of this writer's nomenclature. It is much less frequently used by Paul, not being found at all in his Epistles to the Thessalonians; it occurs also in Peter and James, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the Apocalypse. Of the Synoptists, Matthew, as remarked above, p. 167, has it most frequently (9 times); Mark, apart from 16^{15}, only once; and even Luke only 3 times in the Gospel, and once only, 17^{24}, in the Acts. The cognate term *οἰκουμένη* is found in Matthew only once, 24^{14}; in Mark not at all; in Luke, however, 3 times in the Gospel (2^{1} 4^{5} 21^{26}), and 5 times in Acts; and elsewhere only in Romans once, Epistle to the Hebrews twice, and in Revelation 3 times. This choice of terms by Luke must be attributed to his desire of writing in biblical style. Despite the influence of the earliest Christian tradition in regard to the words of

[1] j. Bab. m. 8c.

LIBRARY OF THE

Jesus, Paul in the Epistles to the Thessalonians did not yet require to use ὁ κόσμος; and thus his testimony agrees with that of the Synoptists in proving that for Jesus the idea had not attained to any importance.

If we turn to the Hebrew compositions of Jewish literature as yet unnoticed, we find that in the *Book of Enoch*, chaps. 72–82, the idea of the "created world," 72^{1} $75^{3.\,8}$ $82^{1.\,5.\,7}$, is certainly recognised. It may be left undecided whether in 81^{3} "the King of the glory of the world," 81^{9} "the Lord of the world," really meant "the eternal King of glory," as in 75^{3}, and "the eternal Lord."

Enoch, chaps. 91–104, contains the expression "to all the generations of the world," 103^{8} 104^{5}, where no time-limit is admissible, and the translation must therefore be "to all generations in perpetuity." In 91^{14a}, however, mention is made of the revelation of the righteous judgment before "all the world"; while the reference to "the world," 91^{14b}, as destined to destruction, is probably an interpolation, because this apocalypse is not apparently cognisant of any destruction of the world.

The *Assumption of Moses* speaks of the "world" (orbis terrarum) only in its framework, namely, $1^{2.\,11.1\,12.\,13.\,14.\,17}$ $11^{8.\,16.\,17}$ 12^{4}, and not in the proper prophetic part, chaps. 2–10. It is worthy of note that 11^{16} and 12^{4} have in juxtaposition "orbis terrarum" and "sæculum." For these, Hebr. offers תֵּבֵל and עוֹלָם.

In the *Apocalypse of Baruch* two of the parts (chaps. 27–29, 36–40), dating from before 70 A.D., do not mention the "world." It occurs, however, in the third of the older sections (chaps. 53–74) several times (54^{1} $56^{2.\,3}$ $73^{1.\,5}$). In the more recent sections the world is the subject of remark, $3^{1.\,7}$ 4^{1} $14^{2.\,13.\,18.\,19}$ $21^{4.\,24}$ 48^{15} 49^{3} $83^{2.\,8}$ 85^{10}. In general עלמא is the corresponding Syriac word, so that the Hebr. may be taken to be עוֹלָם. Only in 3^{7}, where the Syriac version

[1] Dominus orbis terrarum.

has תצביחא beside עלמא, the Greek ὁ κόσμος must have stood as parallel to ὁ αἰών. In this passage עוֹלָם and תֵּבֵל might be proposed as the Hebrew original.

In the *Book of Jubilees*[1] it appears doubtful whether עוֹלָם has been used for the idea of the "world." Reference is indeed made to "the generations of the world," 10^{17}, but also to "the perpetual generations," 4^{25} $8^{12.\ 21}$ 33^{16}, and to "all the generations of the earth," 6^{10} 12^{24} 19^{20} (which has also the reading "omnes generationes sæculi"); cf. above, pp. 164 f., 170. God is called "Lord of the world," 25^{23}, but 25^{15} "God of the ages" (אֱלֹהֵי הָעוֹלָמִים), 13^{8} "eternal God" (where there is another reading at least in the Latin version), and with special frequency "the Creator of all things" (see 2^{32} 11^{17} 17^{3} $22^{4.\ 27}$). "Heaven and earth," not "the world," constitute His creative work, 2^{25}. In the Flood the water fills "the whole world," 5^{24}.

In the *Second Book of Esdras*, "sæculum" (Syr. עלמא) occurs with extraordinary frequency in the sense of the created "world," *e.g.* $3^{9.\ 18.\ 34}$ 4^{24} $5^{44.\ 49}$ $6^{55.\ 59}$ $7^{11.\ 30.\ 31.\ 70.\ 74.\ 132.\ 137}$ $8^{20.\ 41.\ 50}$ $9^{2.\ 5.\ 8.\ 13}$ 11^{40}. These passages cannot in every case be distinctly separated from those in which "sæculum" represents the idea of the "Æon." A Greek original would necessarily have had αἰών throughout, and Heb. 1^{2} 11^{3} confirms this likelihood. The Hebrew original had עוֹלָם.

The later Jewish literature abounds in instances of the use of עוֹלָם = world. It must, indeed, be observed from the outset that a clear distinction of the meanings "age," "eternity," and "world" is not everywhere practicable. As soon as the geographical connotation of κόσμος had been transferred to עוֹלָם, the speaker could at will apprehend it as a magnitude either of space or of time. Whether the school of Shammai really originated the statement[2] that "the

[1] See the translation by *R. H. Charles* in Jew. Quart. Rev. vi. (1894) 184 ff., 710 ff., vii. (1895) 297 ff.

[2] Eduy. i. 13; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 20.

world has been created" (נִבְרָא הָעוֹלָם) solely with a view to propagation, is immaterial. But from the end of the first century עוֹלָם is so commonly used for "world," that it cannot be doubted that this name for the idea was then in general use. It has found its way even into the older Targums; see Onk. Gen. 3^{22}; cf. Targ. Isa. 51^{2} יְחִידַי בְּעָלְמָא, "the only one in the world"; Deut. 33^{28} בְּמֵימְרֵיהּ אִתְעֲבִיד עָלְמָא, "through His (God's) word the world was made";[1] in the Targ. to the prophets, Isa. 41^{4} אֲנָא יְיָ בְּרִית עָלְמָא, "I, Jehovah, created the world." Joshua ben Khananya and Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (*c.* 100 A.D.) dispute concerning the mode of origin and the form of the earth, and the word they use is עוֹלָם.[2] Both agree that God has created[3] "the world" (הָעוֹלָם). A proclamation finds its widest extension if it goes "from one end of the world to the other" (מִסּוֹף הָעוֹלָם וְעַד סוֹפוֹ), according to Joshua ben Khananya.[4] Eliezer ben Hyrcanus uses the same phrase to indicate the utmost range of vision.[5] According to Joshua ben Khananya,[6] "to destroy," "to ruin," may be expressed by "to put out of the world" (הוֹצִיא—מִן הָעוֹלָם). The "fathers of antiquity" (אֲבוֹת עוֹלָם) are now become "the fathers of the world" (אֲבוֹת הָעוֹלָם) according to Simeon ben Yochai;[7] and the "primeval mountains" (הָרֵי עוֹלָם) are the "mountains of the world."[8] Compare גִּבְעוֹת עוֹלָם, Gen. 49^{26}, for which Onkelos has רַבְרְבַיָּא דְּמִן עָלְמָא, "the mighty ones of old"; Targ. Jerus. I. רַבְרְבֵי עָלְמָא, "the great ones of the world"; in Marka, זכאי עלמה, "the pious of the world," Bibl. Sam. iii. 3^{b}; נביאה דעלמה, "the prophet of the world," ibid. 9^{b}. One encounters such expressions as: "to come into the world" (אֲתָא בָּעָלְמָא),

[1] Cf. John 1^{10} ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ (τοῦ λόγου) ἐγένετο.

[2] b. Yoma 54^{b}; b. Bab. b. 25^{a} f.; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 136, 139.

[3] Midr. Psalms 104^{1}; *Bacher*, loc. cit. i. 134. See also j. Ab. z. 42^{c}, which says God rules "the world," whose shape is a globe.

[4] Mechilt. 56^{b} f.; *Bacher*, loc. cit. 153.

[5] Siphre, Num. 136; *Bacher*, loc. cit. 154.

[6] Aboth ii. 11; *Bacher*, loc. cit. 162.

[7] j. Chag. 77^{d}; *Bacher*, loc. cit. 18.

[8] Shir. R. 1^{12}; *Bacher*, loc. cit. 134.

Targ. Eccl. 3^{14} 4^{2};[1] "to come into this world" (אֲתָא לְעָלְמָא הָדֵן),[2] ibid. 5^{15}; "to come upon the world" (אֲתָא עַל עָלְמָא),[3] ibid. 1^{4}, Jerus. I. Deut 5^{21}; "to be in the world" (הֲוָה בְּעָלְמָא),[4] Targ. Eccl. 1^{8}; "to go out of the world" (אִזַל מִן עָלְמָא),[5] ibid. 1^{4}; "to judge the world" (לְמִדַּן עָלְמָא),[6] Targ. 2 Sam. 23^{7}. רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם is, according to j. Shebi. 35^{d}, the first day of the month Tishri, the day of the world's creation. Lastly, "world" can sink down to the mere meaning, "the people." מָה קָלָא בְּעָלְמָא,[7] literally, "what is the voice in the world?" really means: "what do people say? what is being talked about?"

Of the world in its fullest sense, God is readily referred to as the Ruler, Hellenistic expressions no doubt helping as models; cf. *ὁ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεύς*, 2 Macc. 7^{9}; *ὁ κύριος τοῦ κόσμου*, 2 Macc. 13^{14}; *δεσπότης πάσης τῆς κτίσεως*, 3 Macc. 2^{2}. Even in Palmyra the "Lord of Heaven" (בעלשמן) is called "Lord of the world," מָרֵא עָלְמָא, on an inscription of the year 114 A.D. (de Vogüé, 73); and the Samaritan author Marka uses as names for God not only מרה דעלמה, "Lord of the world,"[8] מרה דכל עלמה, "Lord of the whole world,"[9] but also מלכה דעלמה, "King of the world,"[10] and אלהה דעלמה, "God of the world."[11] These three Samaritan appellations, which recall biblical prototypes (see above, p. 163), were in use also among the Jews.

For "Lord of the world," see besides Enoch 81^{10}, Ass. Mos. 1^{11}, Jubilees 25^{23} (cf. above, p. 171), a dictum of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (*c.* 100) רִבּוֹנוֹ שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם;[12] in the

[1] *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, John 1^{9}, Rom. 5^{12}.
[2] *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον*, John 9^{39}.
[3] *ἐπέρχεσθαι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*, Luke 21^{26}.
[4] *εἶναι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, John 9^{5}.
[5] *ἀφιέναι τὸν κόσμον*, John 16^{28}; *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξέρχεσθαι*, 1 Cor. 5^{10}.
[6] *κρίνειν τὸν κόσμον*, John 12^{47}, Rom. 3^{6}.
[7] j. Taan. 66^{d}.
[8] *Heidenheim*, Bibl. Samarit. iii. 10^{b}, 11^{a}.
[9] Ibid. 5^{a}.
[10] Ibid. iii. 10^{b}.
[11] Ibid. iii. 14^{a}.
[12] Mechilta 56^{a}; *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 152.

Targums, רִבּוֹן עָלְמָא in place of the simple הָאָדוֹן, Onk. Ex. 34[22], Targ. Isa. 3[1]; רִבּוֹנֵי עָלְמָא, Targ. Eccl. 4[13] (cf. רִבּוֹנֵיהּ דְּעָלְמָא, j. Taan. 68[d]); רִבּוֹן כָּל עָלְמָא, Targ. Cant. 5[2]. Subsequently the synonymous מָרֵי (מָרֵא) עָלְמָא came into use side by side with רִבּוֹן עָלְמָא, and appears, *e.g.* Targ. Eccl. 5[11]; Cant. 2[13] 8[3]; Targ. Jerus. I. Gen. 22[1]; Tob. 8[14] (Aram. text).

As "King of the world" God is called מֶלֶךְ עָלְמָא (Cod. Reuchl. מ׳ עָלְמַיָּא), Targ. Zech. 14[17], מַלְכָּא דִּי עָלְמָא in the prayer beginning יְקוּם פֻּרְקָן; in Hebrew, chiefly in the blessings מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, *e.g.* Seder Rab Amram, i. 1[b].

"God of the world" appears as אֱלָהּ עָלְמָא, Onk. Gen. 21[33]; Targ. Isa. 40[28] 42[5]; cf., however, above, p. 163 ff.

It is remarkable that none of these designations has found an entrance into the New Testament. Jesus says, Matt. 11[25] (Luke 10[21]), in an invocation of God, not *κύριε τοῦ κόσμου*, but *κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς*. Elsewhere we find: *ὁ αἰώνιος θεός*, Rom. 16[26]; *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων*, 1 Tim. 1[17]. Only Rev. 11[15] speaks of *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου* as having become the portion of God and His Anointed. In 2 Cor. 4[4] Satan is called by Paul: *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, and by John (12[31]): *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*.

A mode of expressing the same idea without the use of the conception *κόσμος* is exemplified in אֲדוֹן כָּל הָאָרֶץ, "Lord of the whole earth," Zech. 4[14] 6[5]; קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ, "possessor of heaven and earth," Gen. 14[19. 22]; *ὁ κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς*, Tob. 8[20] Vat.; *δεσπότης τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῆς γῆς*, Judith 9[17]; מָרֵא דִשְׁמַיָּא וְאַרְעָא, "Lord of heaven and earth," in the prayer דֻּכְרָן טָב[1] and in the Prayer for the Dead;[2] אֱלָהָא דִשְׁמַיָּא וְאַרְעָא, "God of heaven and earth," Tob. 8[15] (Aram.).

Of similar nature are the common designations: "God of heaven," "Lord of heaven," "King of heaven," which have

[1] *Zunz*, Nachtrag zur Litgesch. d. syn. Poesie (1867), 1: מָרֵיהּ שְׁמַיָּא וְאַרְעָא.
[2] *L. M. Landshuth*, Seder bikkur cholim, etc. (1867) 49.

originated not so much with the motive of sharply separating[1] between God and the world, as of emphasising His power as Controller of the whole earth. Even the Phœnicians and Palmyrenians had a "Lord of heaven" (בעל שמן), see above; and a "Queen of heaven" (מלכת השמים) was known in Judah even before the Babylonian Exile (Jer. 44[18]). It was quite a common predicate of Deity which the Jews applied to the God of revelation, when they began after the Exile to style Him "God of heaven." This is found notably in Nehemiah (1[4] 2[4. 20]); see also *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, Judith 6[19]; אֱלָהּ שְׁמַיָּא, Dan. 2[18]; אֱלָהָא דִשְׁמַיָּא, Tob. 8[20] 10[11. 12] (Aram.); for "Lord of heaven," see Enoch 106[11]; Ass. Mos. 4[4]; מָרֵא שְׁמַיָּא, Dan. 5[23]; מָרֵי שְׁמַיָּא, Vay. R. 25; מָרֵיהּ דִשְׁמַיָּא, Koh. R. 3[2]; for "King of heaven," see Dan. 4[34] מֶלֶךְ שְׁמַיָּא; 3 Macc. 2[2] *βασιλεὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν*; Tob. 13[11], Vat. Sin. 16 Sin. *βασιλεὺς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. A rare parallel form to אֱלָהָא דִשְׁמַיָּא appears in מֵימְרָא דִשְׁמַיָּא, the "Word of heaven," Targ. Eccl. 4[4], 11[3].

It is clear that the form of Judaism which readily chose to denominate God as "Lord of the world" cannot fairly be credited with the belief that the world was "altogether fallen into the power of the demons and ripe for judgment." Holtzmann[2] holds that this became the average sentiment among the Jews, whereas in contrast therewith Jesus preferred to adopt a positive attitude with relation to the created world and its blessings. But the pessimism of later Judaism, which expelled the joy of life, is connected with the thought of exile and not with a gloomier view of the condition of creation. The Israel which had produced Ps. 104 and the Song of Solomon was not yet extinct in the time of Jesus. And one must beware of supposing that the mixed population of Galilee was dominated by a conception of life which was peculiarly rabbinic.

In the later Jewish literature there are likewise found

[1] Maintained by Holtzmann, Lehrb. d. Neutest. Theol. i. 50.
[2] Lehrb. d. Neutest. Theol. i. 179.

parallels to those expressions whose real use by Jesus was found open to question. The phrase: *φῶς τοῦ κόσμου*, Matt. 5^{14}, so freely used by John (8^{12}, cf. 3^{19} 9^{5} 12^{46}), is Hellenistic. John 11^{9} speaks of the sun as *τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*. The light of the sun is referred to figuratively, Wisd. 18^{4}, where the Law is called *φῶς τῷ αἰῶνι*, "a Light for the age." Similarly Israel is styled (Shir. R. 1^{3}) a "light for the world" (אוֹרָה לָעוֹלָם), and according to Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Bem. 24^{a}, God is "the Light of the World" (אוֹרוֹ שֶׁל עוֹלָם). It was said [1] of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus that he excelled the sun, which gives its light to this world only, whereas the light of the teacher illuminated both this and the other world. A similar figure is employed by the disciples of Yokhanan ben Zakkai in calling their teacher נֵר הָעוֹלָם, "the lamp of the world" (so in Ab. R. Nath. 25), or נֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל, "the lamp of Israel" (so in Ber. 28^{b}). The lamp illuminating the darkness occupies the place of the light of the sun.

"In the whole world" (Matt. 26^{13}, cf. 24^{14}) would be expressed by בְּכָל עָלְמָא. As for *εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*, Mark 14^{9}, it may be recalled that כָּלֵי עָלְמָא is used to denote "everybody" in Babylonian Aramaic. The Galilean dialect has, however, only כָּל עַמָּא, properly, "every people," in the same sense.[2] Hence in that dialect "the whole world" will also stand for "the whole earth."

Again for *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*, Mark 16^{15}, it may be pointed out that בְּרִיָתָא, literally, "created beings," was a passable term for "mankind." The corresponding Hebr. הַבְּרִיּוֹת was used as early as, by Hillel, *c.* 10 A.D. "Love mankind" is expressed in his formula by חֱוֵי אוֹהֵב הַבְּרִיּוֹת.[3]

[1] Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 73^{a}; *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 352.

[2] The כל עלמא cited under the word עלם by *Levy* in Neuhebr. Wörterbuch from j. Sabb. 10^{c} is, on the authority of the Venice edition, to be taken as כל עמא. j. Bab. m. 8^{d} really contains כולי עלמא; but as it there points back to the immediately preceding כל עמא, it should be amended accordingly. So, too, in j. Ber. 4^{b} כולי עלמא does not seem to be original.

[3] Ab. i. 12, see also Ab. iii. 10, iv. 1, iv. 2; and for the Aramaic term בְּרִיָתָא, Esth. R. 1^{1}; Vay. R. 22.

The "peoples of the world" (Luke 12^{30}) are termed in Hebr. אֻמּוֹת הָעוֹלָם, as by Gamaliel II.[1] and Akiba (both *c.* 110 A.D.);[2] and in Aramaic this would be עַמְמֵי עָלְמָא, though instances to verify it are awanting.

And here הָעוֹלָם contains no suggestion, as Holtzmann[3] supposes, that the peoples are regarded as alienated from God. The "peoples of the world" is a name for the sum-total of the peoples existing upon the earth, just like מִשְׁפְּחוֹת הָאָרֶץ, "the families of the earth," in Zech. 14^{17}. "Since the beginning (creation) of the world" (see above, p. 167) recalls מִתְּחִלַּת בְּרִיָּתוֹ שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם, Ber. R. 3; Vay. R. 25; Aram. מִן יוֹמָא דְּאִתְבְּרִי עָלְמָא, Targ. Ruth 1^{1}; Targ. Cant. 8^{2};[4] cf. יוֹמָא תִנְיָנָא לְבָרְיַת עָלְמָא, "the second day in the creation of the world," Targ. Cant. 8^{6}; "since the beginning of the creation," Jubil. 1^{27}.

4. THE NEW WORLD.

The unusual expression *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενησίᾳ*, Matt. 19^{28} (for which Luke 22^{30} has *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου*), is distinctly Greek, and cannot be literally translated either into Hebr. or Aram. It must be attributed to the evangelist himself. The Jerus. Gospel ventures to replace it by the peculiar בחולודתא דמן ריש, "in the regeneration." The East Syrian version (Cur. Sin. Pesh.) despaired of a verbal reproduction, using בעלמא חדתא, "in the new world." This, in fact, is what would have to be proposed in Jewish Aramaic also. The Apoc. of Baruch already uses, 44^{12}, the term "the new world" (Syr. עלמא חדתא), and 57^{2} "the world that is to be renewed" (Syr. עלמא דמתחדת). Eleazar of Modiim (*c.* 100 A.D.), in the citation given on p. 150) mentions "the new world" (עוֹלָם חָדָשׁ). The Targums also know the term, see

[1] Pesikt. 12^{b}.

[2] Mechilta on Ex. 15^{2}, ed. Friedm. 37^{a}.

[3] Lehrb. d. neutest. Theologie, i. 179.

[4] The Targ. Isa. 41^{4}, Hab. 1^{12} even says מִבְּרֵאשִׁית.

Onk. Deut. 32^{12} בְּעָלְמָא דְּהוּא עָתִיד לְחַדָּתָא, "in the world which He (God) will renew"; Targ. Mic. 7^{14} בְּעָלְמָא דְּהוּא עָתִיד לְאִתְחַדָּתָא, "in the world which will be renewed"; cf. Targ. Hab. 3^{2}; Jerus. I. Deut. 32^{1}. The phrase used by Onkelos is also found in the Kaddish prayer; see Seder Rab Amram, i. 55^{a}, and Sopher. xix. $12.^{1}$ The renewal of the world is spoken of in ancient traditions given in b. Sanh. 92^{b}, 97^{b}, the latter passage being based upon a Hebrew document which is said to have been found in the archives (treasures) of Rome.[2]

This "renewal" of the world has nothing to do with *ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων* in Acts 3^{21}. This is suitably rendered by the Syriac version in keeping with the context: עדמא למוליא זבנא דכלהין אלין ד, "until the fulness of the times, touching all that" (God has spoken). The matters predicted by the prophets shall in their entirety be "established," *i.e.* realised, but not all things in general. Palestinian Aramaic would say: עַד זִמְנָא דְּיִתְקַיְּמוּן כָּל מִלַּיָּא דְּ.

Unlike the verse just mentioned, the idea of the "new creation (creature)" is here in place—Enoch 72^{1}, Jubil. 1^{29}, of the time when God "renews His creation" (Syr. נחדת בריתא), Bar. Apoc. 32^{6}; cf. 2 Esdras 7^{75} incipies creaturam renovare (Syr. עתיד אנת דתחדת בריתך). Just as Paul, Gal. 6^{15}, 2 Cor. 5^{17}, speaks of a *καινὴ κτίσις*, so, too, Jewish literature is able to say that God fashions any one into a new creature (בָּרָא — בְּרִיָּה חֲדָשָׁה), Vay. R. 29. 30; Pes. Rabb., ed. Friedm. 146^{b}; Midr. Ps. 2^{9}.[3] While these instances have in view the real renewal of a person, the position of one who has been acquitted after judgment by God is merely likened to such a renewal by the Amora Yizkhak (*c.* 280), when he represents God as saying to Israel:[4] "do penance in the ten

[1] See *Dalman*, Messianische Texte (1898), 25 f.

[2] *A. Wünsche*, Neue Beiträge, 233, renders according to the reading substituted by the censor, "Persian treasures"; and *M. Buttenwieser*, Die hebr. Elias Apokalypse (1897), 59, even speaks of a "Parsee" tradition.

[3] See my treatise, "Der leidende und der sterbende Messias," 52, 66, 73.

[4] Pes. Rabb., ed. Friedm. 169^{a}; *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. ii. 261.

days between New Year and the day of Atonement; then may I pronounce you free on the day of Atonement, and transform you into a new creature." The address by God to Israel, given by Yose bar Kezarta, is very much alike, namely,[1] "When ye are come before me for judgment at the New Year, and have passed out thence in peace, I reckon it to you as if ye were formed into a new creature."

V. "THE LORD" AS A DESIGNATION FOR GOD.

1. NOT A NAME FOR GOD TO BE FOUND IN ORDINARY USE.

Only in a few passages do the Synoptists put ὁ κύριος as a name for God into the mouth of Jesus; and even in these the evidence is uncertain. Mark 5^{19} has ὁ κύριος, but the parallel, Luke 8^{39}, has ὁ θεός, and conversely Luke 20^{37} has κύριος, while Matt. 22^{31} (Mark 12^{26}) has ὁ θεός. Matt. 24^{22}, by inverting the sentence through the use of the passive voice, dispenses with the κύριος used in Mark 13^{20}. The fact may thus be inferred from the Gospels that in His own discourses Jesus did not apply to God any Aramaic name equivalent to κύριος. The usage in quotations from Scripture will be specially considered under 2. In this respect Jesus did not adopt a mode of speech quite peculiar to Himself. For an Aramaic name for God, directly answering to ὁ κύριος, never did exist among the Jews. When ὁ κύριος or *dominus* is met in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, that implies merely that the divine name יהוה was written in the original, which might be in Hebrew, and hence that there was no scruple in writings of this kind against employing the sacred name. It does not, however, follow that "the Lord" was a divine appellation really found in ordinary use. The significant transition from the divine name "Jahve" to the

[1] j. R. h. S. 59c.

divine name "Lord" did not take place in the region of Hebraic Judaism.[1] It is rather a peculiarity of Jewish Hellenism, and from that source found its way into the language of the Church, even of the Semitic-speaking part of it. For מָרְיָא in the Syriac of Edessa, and for מָרָא in the Christian Palestinian, there is no Jewish parallel. Not till a very late period was the Greek *κύριος* in the form קִירִיס adopted also among the Jews who spoke Aramaic. The Jerusalem Targums on the Pentateuch,[2] and the Targums on Job and the Psalms, do indeed employ קִירִיס; still it never was a term popularly used.

The facts above stated do not exclude the possibility of designating God upon occasion as Lord of a particular person or persons. The Targum illustrates this by rendering אָבִי "my Father," Jer. 3[4. 19], by means of רִבּוֹנִי, "my Lord." In addition, there may be given the following examples, which at the same time supply evidence that the suffix of the Old Testament אדני, in speaking of and to God, was by no means otiose. In prayer, God is addressed in Aram. as מָרִי, Ber. R. 13; in Hebr. as רִבּוֹנִי, j. Ber. 7[d]; Siphra, ed. Weiss, 112[a]. Similarly in the Aramaic prayer, beginning בַּת צִיּוֹן עֲנֵה,[3] the daughter of Zion calls her God אֱלָהִי וּמָרִי, "my God and my Lord." The phrase מָרַן דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא, "our Lord, who art in heaven," is used when Israel turns to God in יְקוּם פֻּרְקָן,[4] as also in the prayer[5] prefaced by the same words; and the older form מָרָנָא is seen in the prayer מָה נְפַתַּח.[5] The Levites say to Nebuchadnezzar, Targ. Sheni Esth. 1[2]:[6] "How can we sing the praise of 'our Lord' (מָרַיְנָן) before thee?" after the king had just spoken of God as "your mighty Lord of Jerusalem"

[1] This has not been sufficiently emphasised in my "Der Gottesname Adonaj und seine Geschichte," 80 f.

[2] See also Machzor Vitry, 337, 341.

[3] Roman Machzor (Bologna, 1540), Selikhoth for the days before New Year; cf. *Zunz*, Litteraturgeschich. d. synagog. Poesie, 18, 74.

[4] *Baer's* Seder Abodath Yisrael, 229.

[5] Roman Machzor, loc. cit.

[6] See *M. David*, Das Targum scheni nach Handschriften herausgegeben (1898).

(מָרֵיכוֹן רַבָּא דִירוּשְׁלֶם). In words addressed to an Israelite, the Jews are called בְּנֵי מָרֵיךְ, "the sons of thy Lord," j. Khag. 77[d]; j. Sanh. 23[c]; j. R. h. S. 58[a]. In relation to the community of Israel, God is "its Lord," מָרַהָא, Targ. Cant. 8[10], and מָרַהּ in the prayer mentioned above, בַּת צִיּוֹן עֲנֵיָה. In a popular way of speaking, b. Yom. 86[a], God is called מָרֵיהּ, "his Lord," *i.e.* of any one whose sins He forgives. Nimrod's being styled "a hunter before the Lord," Gen. 10[9], implies, according to Siphra 111[b], that he knew "his Lord" (רִבּוֹנוֹ), and rebelled against Him intentionally. In an address to King Nebuchadnezzar, the temple of God is called בֵּיתֵיהּ דְּמָרָךְ, "the house of thy Lord," Ech. R. Peth. 23; and even of the locust it is said, j. Taan. 66[d], that it bears the name נוֹבֵי, "because it executes the punishment decreed by its Lord" (הוּ נָבֵי דִינָא דְמָרֵיהּ).

While the designation of God as "Lord of any one" is comparatively rare in Jewish literature, the Samaritan Marka makes a copious use of it. According to him, Moses, in the presence of Pharaoh, calls God not only מָרִי, "my Lord," but also מָרָן, "our Lord"; and the sea in an address to Moses calls God מָרָךְ,[1] "thy Lord." In his narrative the God of Moses is called מרה.[2] That may be pointed so as to read מָרֵיהּ, "his Lord," but also מָרָה, "the Lord." The latter must be assumed where מרה is vocative.[3] In general, however, it is מָרֵיהּ that is intended, since Marka, when speaking for himself as an author, usually writes מָרָן,[4] "our Lord," for God.

Even on an Egyptian papyrus written in Aramaic a heathen god is spoken of as מָרָאִי, "my Lord"; see CIS, ii. 1. 144.

To this use of "Lord" the Gospels have no real parallel; for the similar expressions in the parables, which treat of the relation between master and servant, as in Matt. 24[46] (Luke 12[43]), do not belong to this category. It is not in itself impossible that the Hellenistic (ὁ) *κύριος* should have in some

[1] *Heidenheim*, Bibl. Sam. iii. 48[a] f.
[2] Ibid. 9[a].
[3] Ibid. 6[a].
[4] Ibid. 139[b], 163[a].

measure supplanted the Aram. מָרֵא when coupled with suffixes; but in any case Jesus did not make an extensive use of מָרֵא, for His preference was to speak of God as "Father."

2. SUBSTITUTE FOR THE TETRAGRAMMATON (יהוה).

Another question arises as to what Jesus actually said when occasion required the expression of the tetragrammaton in quotations from the Old Testament, *e.g.* Matt. 22[37] (Mark 12[30], Luke 10[27]); Matt. 22[44] (Mark 12[36], Luke 20[42]). It may be accepted as certain that by the time of Jesus the divine name יהוה had long disappeared from popular use, and that in the public reading of Holy Scripture the word was replaced by אדני.[1] It may be added that this practice, strangely enough, was followed in rendering the Scriptures into Aramaic in the worship of the synagogue,—a custom which the vocalised Targum texts indicate by the expedient that, along with the symbol commonly used for יהוה, vowels are given which require the word אדני to be pronounced, and also by the fact that they also put this same symbol for אדני.

From this it must not be inferred that אדני, apart from the public reading of Scripture, was used in mere quotations from Scripture. Among the Samaritans[2] the custom is to substitute שְׁמָא, "the Name," for the tetragrammaton; and this holds invariably, even in reading the Law. A. Geiger[3] was of opinion that the original Jewish usage was the same, and that later on, in imitation of the Hellenistic *κύριος*, אדני was introduced instead of שְׁמָא. This, however, is incapable of proof. All that is assured is merely the Jewish custom of saying in *citations* from Scripture not אדני, but הַשֵּׁם, "the Name."[4] Early examples of the use of הַשֵּׁם for

[1] See my treatise, "Der Gottesname Adonaj und seine Geschichte" (1889), 36 ff.

[2] See *J. H. Petermann*, Ling. Samarit. Gramm. (1873) 78.

[3] Nachgelassene Schriften, iii. 261.

[4] Cf., *e.g.*, the model given by *M. Grünwald*, Spagnolische und spanisch-türkische Schrifttafeln (1894).

the tetragrammaton—apart from Lev. $24^{11.\ 16}$—may be illustrated by the phrases: פֵּרֵשׁ הַשֵּׁם, "to pronounce clearly the tetragrammaton," Sanh. vii. 5; הָנָה הַשֵּׁם, "to read the tetragrammaton," Sanh. x. 1; קִלֵּל בַּשֵּׁם, "to curse by (using) the tetragrammaton," Sanh. vii. 8; שָׁאַל שְׁלוֹם בַּשֵּׁם, "to greet by (using) the tetragrammaton, Ber. ix. 5; cf. בֵּרַךְ אֶת־הַשֵּׁם, "to curse God," b. Sanh. 46^{a}, 56^{a}. From Yoma iii. 8, iv. 2, vi. 2, the high priest, in the temple on the day of Atonement, even appears to have begun the confession of sins with the words אָנָּא הַשֵּׁם representing אָנָּא יהוה.[1] לַשֵּׁם means "for God," Shek. vi. 6; Yoma iv. 1.

It may accordingly be inferred that in citations of Scripture Jesus was wont to use הַשֵּׁם when He quoted in Hebrew, and שְׁמָא when Aramaic was used, but not אֲדֹנָי, despite the fact that the Gospels contain no trace of this usage,—which, indeed, would be unintelligible to Hellenists and Greeks.

The biblical style of Hellenistic authors but not the Jewish-Hebrew type of language is marked by expressions such as *ἄγγελος κυρίου*,[2] Matt. $1^{20.\ 24}$ $2^{13.\ 19}$ 28^{2}, Luke 1^{11} 2^{9}; *ὁ ναὸς τοῦ κυρίου*, Luke 1^{9}; (*ὁ*) *νόμος κυρίου*, Luke $2^{23f.\ 39}$; *δικαιώματα τοῦ κυρίου*, Luke 1^{6}; *δουλὴ κυρίου*, Luke 1^{38}; *χεὶρ κυρίου*, Luke 1^{66}; *δὸξα κυρίου*, Luke 2^{9}; *δύναμις κυρίου*, Luke 5^{17}; *ὁ Χριστὸς κυρίου*, Luke 2^{26}. A Hebraist, indeed, might also have written these expressions — which are mostly peculiarities of Luke—if he were consciously imitating the language of the Old Testament; but the popular mode of speech was quite different. In such locutions the name of God was either entirely omitted, as in הַהֵיכָל, הַתּוֹרָה, בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, or else replaced by mere suggestions of the divine name.

[1] On the other hand, the reading הַשֵּׁם, adopted by *H. L. Strack*, Yoma iii. 8, in the citation Lev. 16^{30}, on the basis of MSS. collated by Rabbinovicz, and of old prints, is incorrect, and should be replaced by יְיָ.

[2] One must not seek to find in this "*the* angel of the Lord" of the Old Testament. *ἄγγελος* is defined by *κυρίου* as a messenger of God. The reference is to one of the *ἄγγελοι* (*τοῦ*) *θεοῦ*, Matt. 22^{30}, Luke $12^{8f.}$. See also p. 197.

VI. THE FATHER IN HEAVEN.

1. THE ISRAELITISH-JEWISH USAGE.

That God is the father of Israel is attested for the first time, Ex. 4^{22}, in the words: "Israel is my son, my firstborn." But while Israel here receives merely the first rank among the peoples, who all are sons of God, other passages refer to the Israelites as sons of God, in the idea that this can be predicated of them alone: Deut. 32^{5}, Isa. 1^{4} 30^{9}, Hos. 2^{1},[1] Deut. 14^{1}, Jer. 3^{14} 31^{20}, Isa. 43^{6} 45^{11}, Mal. 2^{10}. Correspondingly, God is called "father" of the Israelites: Deut. 32^{6}, Jer. $3^{4.\,19}$ 31^{8}, Isa. 63^{16} 64^{7}, Mal. 1^{6}, 1 Chron. 29^{10}. The significance of this relation lay chiefly in the solicitude which the Israelites might expect on the part of God, and in the obedience which they were bound to yield to Him. The assumption is that the Israelites are the servants of God, and members of His family; God on His part recognises the rights and obligations of the head of a household in relation to the members of the house.[2] In Jeremiah (cf. 3^{4} with 2^{27}), the Second Isaiah (43^{6} 64^{7}), and in Malachi (2^{10}), it is also affirmed that the "father" is the originator of the existence of the son, and hence God as the creator of Israel is his father.

The son of Sirach has obviously maintained the exceptional position of his people, whom God has likened to a firstborn son, 36^{17}. At the same time he makes an application of the idea of the fatherhood to the position of the individual Israelite. The individual is a being who has been called into existence by God, $23^{1.\,4}$. In this passage *κύριε πάτερ καὶ δέσποτα* (v.[4] *θεέ*) *ζωῆς μου* is to be retraced to יהוה אָבִי וַאֲדֹנֵי[3]

[1] In Hos. 11^{1} בָּנָיו should be read for בְּנִי. Further, the term in Hosea and Isaiah appears to have been one already current, not first introduced by these prophets.

[2] Israel as the "house" of God (בֵּית יְהוָה), Hos. 8^{1}, Jer. 12^{7}.

[3] Cf. Ps. 42^{9} אֵל חַיָּי.

UNIVERS OF CALIFORN

חַיַּי, in which I cannot, like Cremer,[1] detect any influence of heathen views. The same applies to Sir. 51[10]. In *κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου* we have only to replace *κυρίου* by *κύριον*. The original may have had: יהוה אָבִי וַאדֹנָי, "Jehovah my Father and my Lord."[2] The Book of Wisdom insists strongly on the idea that the *righteous* man has God for his father, not only by calling God, 2[16], "the father of the pious," but also by its predilection for *παῖς κυρίου* (see, *e.g.*, 2[13]) and *υἱὸς θεοῦ* (2[18]) as designations of the righteous man. God is addressed as *πάτερ*, 14[3]. This application to the individual does not prevent the author from also calling the nation Israel the "son of God" (*θεοῦ υἱός*, 18[13]). According to 3 Macc. 5[7], God is for Israel a "father."

In Palestinian circles, in harmony with the Old Testament view, it is generally the *Israelites* as such who have God in relation to themselves as "their father,"—an idea which implies the love that God bears, in a special sense, to His own people in distinction from other peoples,—a love which has to be requited with obedience and trust on the part of its members. Thus the goal of Israel's history is described, Jubil. 1[24f.], in these terms: "Their souls (of the Israelites) will attach themselves to Me and to all My commands, and My commands will return to them; and I will be to them a father, and they shall be My children. And they shall all be called children of the living God; and every angel and every spirit shall surely recognise that these are My children, and that I am their father in sincerity and righteousness, and that I do love them." In Tob. 13[4] God is termed "our Father"; "His sons" are the pious Israelites according to Enoch 62[11]. In Ps. Sol. 17[30] it is said of them that they will be recognised by the Messiah as "sons of their God." In the Pseudepigrapha the name of father is nowhere

[1] Bibl. theol. Wörterbuch,[8] 752.

[2] The Syriac version has: אבי מן כרוכא מריא ננברא ופרוקא, which admits of being referred to: אֲבִי מִפָּרוֹם יְהוָה גִּבּוֹר וּמוֹשִׁיעַ.

used as a designation of God. The dicta of the Rabbis from the end of the first Christian century onwards, are the earliest source of instances. The "heavenly Father," *i.e.* God, is conceived as the counterpart of the "earthly father," as appears from a saying of Simeon ben Yokhai, *c.* 130 A.D. He declares that a wise son not only makes "his earthly father" (אָבִיו שֶׁבָּאָרֶץ) glad, but also "his heavenly Father" (אָבִיו שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם).[1] The love of his child is here the chief mark of the father. Akiba (*c.* 120 A.D.) says:[2] "The Israelites are beloved (by God), for they are called God's children (בָּנִים לַמָּקוֹם) [it is due to] the exceptional love [of God that[3]] it was made known to them that they are called God's children, as it is said, Deut. 14[1] 'Ye are the children of Jehovah, your God.'" The same idea is expressed by Gamaliel II. (*c.* 100 A.D.), who declared concerning Israel:[4] מִדְּאַרְגִּיזוּ בְּנַיָּא חֲבִיבַיָּא קֳדָם אֲבוּהוֹן[5] דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא[6] אֲקֵים עֲלֵיהוֹן מַלְכָּא חַנְפָּא, "since the beloved children provoked their heavenly Father to anger, He set over them an impious king." The Israelites are full of confidence in having recourse to this "heavenly Father." It is said in Rosh ha-Shana iii. 8, no author being named, that during the battle with Amalek it was not the uplifting of the hands of Moses that procured the victory for Israel, nor yet the serpent set up by Moses that brought them healing, but the fact "that the Israelites lifted up their eyes and directed their heart towards their heavenly Father" (שֶׁיִּשְׂרָאֵל מִסְתַּכְּלִין כְּלַפֵּי מַעֲלָה וּמְכַוְּנִין לִבָּם לַאֲבִיהֶם שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם).[7] He it is who hears the prayer of Israel; hence the Kaddish[8] says: תִּתְקַבַּל צְלוֹתְהוֹן

[1] Siphre, Deut. 48, ed. Friedm. 84b; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 131.

[2] Aboth iii. 14.

[3] Read שֶׁנּוֹדַעַת for נוֹדַעַת.

[4] Midr. Abba Gorjon 1[1]; cf. *Bacher*, loc. cit. i. 96.

[5] Esth. R. 1[1] has the Galilean form מִן דְּאַכְעֲסוּן, and inserts עֲבָדֵיהוֹן in front of קֳדָם.

[6] Thus in Est. R. 1[1].

[7] So it should be read according to Manuskr. München, see *Rabbinovicz*, Variæ Lectiones zu b. R. h. S. 29a. Cf. Targ. Jerus. I. Num. 21[9]: אִין מְכַוֵּן לִבֵּיהּ לְשׁוֹם מֵימְרָא דַיָּי, "If he direct his heart to the Name of the Word of Jehovah."

[8] Seder Rab Amram, i. 13b.

וּבְעוּתְהוֹן דְּכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל קֳדָם אֲבוּהוֹן דִּי בִשְׁמַיָּא, "may the prayers and tears of all Israel be accepted before their heavenly Father!" When every other refuge and hope fails, there remains for Israel nothing but the cry:[1] עַל מִי לָנוּ לְהִשָּׁעֵן עַל אָבִינוּ שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם, "upon whom shall we put our trust? upon our Father in heaven." It was not unknown to the Jews that the Christians claimed God for themselves as their Father. Thus Juda ben Shalom (*c.* 300) said:[2] "God foresaw that the Gentiles would translate the Law, and read it in Greek and say, 'we are Israel.' Then spake God to him (Moses), 'See, Moses, the Gentiles will say, we are Israel, we are the sons of God' (אֲנַן בְּנַיָּא שַׁלְּטָנָיָא)." See also p. 190 f.

The following examples, which might easily be multiplied, illustrating the fatherly relation of God towards the individual Israelite, may here be adduced. Only two persons are addressed in the astonished exclamation of an aged man, j. Maas 50c "To your heavenly Father (לַאֲבוּכוֹן דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא) ye give it not (an offering due to Him); yet ye give it to me!" Eleazar ben Azarya (*c.* 100 A.D.) speaks of the things which "his Father in heaven" has forbidden to him.[3] Yehuda ben Tema (before 200) gives the exhortation:[4] "be bold as a leopard, quick as an eagle, swift as a gazelle, and strong as a lion 'to do the will of thy heavenly Father' (לַעֲשׂוֹת רְצוֹן אָבִיךָ שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם)." Of the same nature are also the words of Nathan[5] (*c.* 160) commenting upon Ex. 20[6], in the light of the period of religious persecution under Hadrian: "'those who love me and keep my commandments'—these are the Israelites who dwell in Palestine and give up their life for the commandments. Why art thou slain?—because I have circumcised my sons. Why art thou burned?—because I have read in the Law. Why art thou crucified?—because I have eaten

[1] Sot. ix. 15 (anonym.).
[2] Pes. Rabb. 14b.
[3] See above, p. 96 f.
[4] Aboth v. 20; b. Pes. 112a; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 556.
[5] Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 68b; Vay. R. 32; Midr. Ps. 12[5]; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 437.

unleavened bread. Why art thou scourged?—because I have done the 'will of my heavenly Father' (רְצוֹן אַבָּא שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם).[1] This is that which is written (Zech. 13[6]): And they say to him, what mean these wounds? and he answers, they were inflicted upon me in the house 'of those who caused me to be beloved' (מְאֹהָבַי)—these wounds have brought it about 'that I am beloved by my Father in heaven'" (לֶיאֱהֹב לְאָבִי שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם). Simeon ben Eleazar (*c.* 200) explained the statement in the Law regarding mixed textures (שעטנז), as implying that whosoever wears such a vestment "is perverted" (נָלוֹז) and "alienates" (מֵלִיז)[2] from himself "his heavenly Father." In an Aramaic Haggada for the Feast of Weeks,[3] it is said of the Joseph of the Old Testament story: אַפֵּיהּ לְמָרְתֵּיהּ וְלִבֵּיהּ לְאָבוּהִי דְּשְׁמַיָּא, "his face was turned towards the wife of his master, but his heart was directed to his heavenly Father."

The gradual adoption of the divine name "our Father in heaven" as a popular substitute for the then obsolete tetragrammaton, is a clear proof that the view represented by H. H. Wendt requires considerable restriction. "In later Judaism," he says,[4] "up to the time of Jesus there had been no development in the conception of God, in the sense that grace and truth were more strenuously insisted on as paramount elements in the divine nature and character, leading in consequence to a greater readiness to apply the name of Father to God." But "a greater readiness to apply the name of Father to God" on the part of the Jews is a historical fact; and Jesus adopted this term for God from the popular usage of His time. Judaism, above all, as it existed in the time of Jesus, must not be depicted according to the developed system of subsequent Rabbinism, least of all when the excrescences in the latter are set up as the norm of

[1] So in Vay. R. 32.
[2] Kil. ix. 8; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 433.
[3] Machzor Vitry, 342.
[4] Die Lehre Jesu, ii. 144.

Judaism, and when all traces of genuine religious feeling which it exhibits are either overlooked or eliminated.[1]

The instances cited above also show the incorrectness of the idea that the relation of God to the individual was not set forth until the New Testament revelation. Of course the individual Israelite was aware that it was only as a member of his people that he possessed the claim to and prospect of God's help and patronage. But the Old Testament shows abundant traces of the conviction that God's providence is directed not only to the people as a whole, but also to every single member of the nation. It was therefore nothing novel when the fatherly relation of God was also applied within the Jewish community to the individual.

2. THE USAGE IN THE LANGUAGE OF JESUS.

(*a*) *My, your heavenly Father.*

The current designation of God, *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν (τοῖς) οὐρανοῖς* (*ὁ οὐράνιος*), which never appears without an accompanying pronoun (*μου*,[2] *ἡμῶν*, *ὑμῶν*), occurs among the words of Jesus in Matthew 20 times, in Mark only once, 11^{25}, in Luke not at all—although in Luke 11^{13} his use of *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* betrays his acquaintance with the title. The same motive which caused Luke to change *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* into *ἡ β. τοῦ θεοῦ* has here, too, been at work. A mode of speech distinctively Jewish and not at the same time biblical had to be avoided. The Jewish carefulness always to make it clear through the addition of "in heaven" that "Father" referred to God, might seem superfluous to the Hellenist.

The conception of God as father of the Israelites was not altogether unrecognised even by Jesus. In Matt. 15^{26}

[1] I have sought to urge a juster estimate of the religious condition of the Jewish community in the time of the second temple, in "Das Alte Testament ein Wort Gottes," Leipzig, 1896.

[2] *σου* is accidentally absent, as *ὁ πατήρ σου* precedes in Matt. 6^{18}.

(Mark 7^{27}) He compares in a figurative way the Israelites to "the children" (*τέκνα*), the heathen to "the dogs" (*κυνάριοι*), which latter, indeed, also belong to the household, but must not be maintained at the expense of children.[1] But this point of view is by no means decisive in His designation of God as Father. Much rather is God regarded either as the Heavenly Father of *His own disciples*, Matt. $5^{16.\ 45.\ 48}$ $6^{1.\ 9.\ 14}$ (Mark 11^{25}) $6^{26.\ 32}$ 7^{11} 18^{14} 23^{9}, or else as the Heavenly Father *of Jesus Himself*, Matt. 7^{21} $10^{32f.}$ 12^{50} 15^{13} 16^{17} $18^{10.\ 19.\ 35}$. He thus indicates the unique personal relation which subsists between God and, in the first place, Jesus Himself, but also between God and those who are His, who can be spoken of as "sons of the theocracy," Matt. 13^{38}. At the same time, Jesus draws a sharp line of distinction between Himself and the disciples in purposely setting aside the usual Jewish "our Father in heaven," where He Himself is concerned, and yet prescribing its use for His disciples, Matt. 6^{9}. From this, too, it may be perceived that it was not the veneration of those who came after that first assigned to Him an exceptional relation to God, incapable of being transferred to others. On the Sonship of Jesus see, further, Fundamental Ideas, X.

(*b*) *My, your Father.*

In Jewish parlance it is unusual to refer to God in common discourse informally as Father without adding the epithet "heavenly." It is only in prayers that a different course is followed. The fifth and sixth petitions of the "Eighteen Supplications"[2]—the daily prayer which took form *c.* 110 A.D.—entreat the working of penitence and the forgiveness of sins by God, whom Israel ventures to name,

[1] In a somewhat different sense, Matt. 8^{12}, the Israelites as "sons of the kingdom" (*υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας*) are distinguished from strangers; cf. p. 115.

[2] The "Shemoneh Esreh" (eighteen), for which see *Schürer*, Hist. of the Jewish People, Div. II. vol. ii. p. 85 f.; and *Dalman*, Messianische Texte aus d. nachkanon. jüd. Litt. (1898), pp. 19–24.

firstly אֲבִינוּ, "our Father," and then מַלְכֵּנוּ, "our King." The petitions begin הֲשִׁיבֵנוּ אָבִינוּ לְתוֹרָתֶךָ, "bring us back, Our Father, to Thy Law!" and סְלַח לָנוּ אָבִינוּ כִּי חָטָאנוּ, "forgive us, Our Father, for we have sinned!" So, too, a prayer in Tob. 13[4] Vat. has *θεὸς αὐτὸς πατὴρ ἡμῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας* (absent from Hebr. and Aram.). Akiba (*c.* 120) once brought rain in answer to a short prayer which began: אָבִינוּ מַלְכֵּנוּ, "Our Father and our King."[1] The biblical phraseology was obviously the model in prayers, and in them there was no danger of ambiguity.

Apart from prayers, the Targums show that great care was exercised against the use of the single word "father" for God. The Targ. Jerus. II. Exod. 15[2], it is true, makes young children in presence of their fathers say, in reference to God, "*He* is our Father," דֵּין הוּא אֲבוּנָן.[2] In that case the narrower designation by בִּשְׁמַיָּא did not suit the occasion. Again, in Deut. 32[6], where God calls Himself the Father of Israel, Onkelos renders אָבִיךָ literally by אֲבוּךְ, while Targ. Jerus. II. is singular in giving אֲבוּכוֹן דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא. But when Israel calls God his Father, the Targumist does not venture to give a literal reproduction.[3] For אָבִינוּ, Isa. 63[16] 64[7], he puts the whole sentence: דְּרַחֲמָךְ עֲלָנָא סַגִּיאִין כְּאַב עַל בְּנִין, "Thou, whose mercy towards us abounds as that of a father to sons"; and in Jer. 3[4. 19] he changes אָבִי into רִבּוֹנִי, "my Lord." He had, however, no scruple in rendering the אָבִי as used by an idolater 2[27] by אֲבוּנָא, "our Father."

Jesus never, as it seems, addressed God in prayer as "My Father in heaven," but only as "My Father." It makes no difference whether the Greek has merely *πάτερ*, as in Matt. 11[25] (Luke 10[21]), Luke 22[42] 23[34. 46]; or *ὁ πατήρ*, as in Matt. 11[26] (Luke 10[21]), Mark 14[36]; or *πάτερ μου*, as in Matt. 26[39. 42]. For in each case the word to be presupposed

[1] b. Taan. 25[b]; *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 330.

[2] Jerus. I. Lev. 22[28] אֲבוּנָן, which has no meaning if uttered by God, should be changed into אֲנָן, according to j. Meg. 75[c].

[3] Still in Mal. 2[10] אָב without suffix is replaced by אַבָּא.

on the testimony of Mark 14^{36} (cf. Rom. 8^{15}, Gal. 4^{6}) is *ἀββᾶ* (אַבָּא). This is just the definite form, and therefore means strictly "the Father"; but during the obsolescence of the form with the pronominal suffix (אָבִי still to be seen Dan. 5^{13})[1] it became the regular form for "my Father," just as אִמָּא, "the mother," was also said for "my mother."[2] This Aramaic idiom has even found its way into the Hebrew of the Mishna.[3] There, too, it appears that אַבָּא could be said in the name of several children, thus acquiring the force of "our Father."[4] Hence it would not be impossible to derive *πάτερ* in the Lord's Prayer, Luke 11^{2}, from אַבָּא, although in a prayer the more solemn form אֲבוּנָא, Galil. אָבוּנָן, "Our Father," has greater probability in its favour.

אַבָּא, אֲבוּנָא as a title of address to God meant something different when used by Jesus to what was implied by מַלְכֵּנוּ, qualified though it was by אָבִינוּ of the Shemoneh Esreh and Akiba. The usage of family life is transferred to God: it is the language of the child to its father.

Jesus also speaks of God as *ὁ πατήρ μου*, Matt. 11^{27} (Luke 10^{22}) 20^{23} 25^{34} $26^{29.\,53}$. The Father of the Son of man, He calls *ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ* (*i.e.* Aram. אֲבוּהִי), Matt. 16^{27} (Mark 8^{38}). The Father of the disciples is *ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν* (אֲבוּכוֹן), Matt. 6^{8} $10^{20.\,29}$; *ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶν* (אֲבוּהוֹן), Matt. 13^{43}; *ὁ πατήρ σου* (אֲבוּךְ), Matt. $6^{4.\,6.\,18}$. It must be conceded that, for each particular instance, there is no certitude that even here Jesus used the appellation of Father without addition. It might be that every instance of *ὁ πατήρ μου, σου, ὑμῶν*, not addressed directly to God, ought to contain the addition *ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. This alone would correspond to the terminology of Rabbinic literature. Nevertheless the existence of a well-

[1] אֲנִי also occurs once Targ. Esth. ii. 1^{1}, according to MS. Orient 2375 in the British Museum.

[2] See Gramm. des jüd. pal. Aram. 157 f.

[3] *E.g.* Keth. ii. 6, xiii. 5; Ned. ii. 1. See *A. Geiger*, Lehrbuch zur Sprache des Mischnah, 50.

[4] Bab. b. ix. 3; Shebu. vii. 7.

founded tradition remains quite possible, to the effect that Jesus did not closely adhere to the Jewish phraseology on this point, and that He did, in fact, sometimes speak exclusively of the Father, of Himself and those that were His. On this hypothesis the consistent omission of the supplement in Luke would appear to have some historical justification.

(*c*) *The Father.*

A special consideration is required for those passages in which, excluding cases of address, the simple *ὁ πατήρ* appears with no pronoun added.

Luke 9^{26} should be brought into agreement with Matt. 16^{27} (Mark 8^{38}). Jesus can surely not have said that the Son of Man will come *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων*, but *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων*. Moreover, *αὐτοῦ* is omitted in Luke merely for the sake of euphony, as it has been used just before.

In the saying of our Lord Acts 1^{7}, *ὁ πατήρ* as uttered by Jesus would have to be retraced to אֲבִי, which might just as well represent *ὁ πατήρ μου*. The saying would thus have been: "It is not for you to know times or seasons which *My* Father determined in the exercise of His own authority." Still we may here have an expression which just slipped from the pen of the author, because it was otherwise familiar to him.

There remain now only the passages in which *ὁ πατήρ* and *ὁ υἱός* mutually condition each other, where no pronoun is admissible, namely, Matt. 11^{27} (Luke 10^{22}), Matt. 24^{36} (Mark 13^{32}), and Matt. 28^{19}. Of these the first vindicates itself as an utterance of Jesus. When Jesus testifies that all things are delivered unto Him by "His Father," and adds that only "the Son" and "the Father" are mutually known to each other, the statement may be understood as a reference

to a real relationship which exists universally between a father and a son, and thus finds also an application as between Jesus and His Father. In that case *ὁ πατήρ* and *ὁ υἱός* were not used as theological terms, and אַבָּא and בְּרָא are not unlikely equivalents.

It is different with Matt. 24[36] (Mark 13[32]), where the angels and "the Son" are ignorant of something which only "the Father" knows. In this case the terms *ὁ υἱός* and *ὁ πατήρ* are not due to comparison with each other, but appear as a ready-made formula, and are therefore to be attributed to the influence of the Church vocabulary on the text. If *οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι—οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός* were taken separately as a supplementary illustration of the preceding *οὐδείς*, then *ὁ πατήρ*, which alone would remain, could be referred to אַבָּא = *ὁ πατήρ μου*, as the form used by Jesus, just as in the similar case Acts 1[7]. It is, however, more probable that the original was, "not even the angels know it," and that the ending, "nor the Son, but the Father only," should be regarded as an accretion.

A similar amplification of an originally shorter expression presents itself also in the baptismal commission, Matt. 28[19], of which it is intended to treat specially in a later volume.

VII. OTHER DIVINE NAMES.

1. GOD (*ὁ θεός*).

All three Synoptists record the use by Jesus of *ὁ θεος*. This must appear somewhat surprising, if the language of the Mishna be brought into comparison. The tractate which most frequently afforded occasion for the use of divine names—Pirke Aboth—has שָׁמַיִם, "Heaven," 8 times; הַמָּקוֹם, "the Place," 5 times; הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא, "the Holy One, blessed be He," 3 times; and אָבִיךְ שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם "heavenly Father," הַשֵּׁם

"the Name," הַשֵּׁם "the Dwelling-place," once each. But, on the other hand, אֱלֹהִים no less than יְיָ (יהוה) occurs only in quotations from the Bible, the latter appearing also in a form of prayer. The tractate Berakhoth has שָׁמַיִם twice, הַמָּקוֹם once; and הַשֵּׁם and יְיָ appear only in prayers and quotations. Similarly the tractate Yoma has once each: הַמָּקוֹם, הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא, אֲבִיכֶם שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם; in prayers הַשֵּׁם; in Bible quotations יְיָ, but never אֱלֹהִים. Frequently the divine name is entirely evaded by circumlocutions, or simply omitted. In a quotation, Gen. 1^{27} would have been written בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים, "in the image of God"; but where it does not form part of a quotation, *e.g.* Ab. iii. 15, בְּצֶלֶם alone is expressed, the reader being expected to know that the image of God is meant. "Distinguished are the Israelites," חֲבִיבִין יִשְׂרָאֵל, says Akiba, Ab. iii. 14, meaning "distinguished by God." In Ber. ix. 2 appears the prayer יְהִי רָצוֹן, "may it be well-pleasing," without, however, expressing the necessary complement "*before God*"; and in Yoma i. 5 the high priest takes an oath for the due performance of his duties in the temple "by Him who causes His name to dwell in this house."

That this mode of procedure in the Mishna was no innovation, is evident from the fact that the Book of Esther entirely omits the divine name—not, as is sometimes supposed, owing to the irreligious disposition of the author, but as a result of his reverence for divine things. Again, the First Book of Maccabees, despite frequent mention of religious matters, has used שָׁמַיִם, "Heaven," as a designation of God, only nine times in all, and never speaks of "God." The Aramaic part of Daniel (Dan., chaps. 2–7) avoided the use of יהוה, and denoted the true God by אֱלָהּ שְׁמַיָּא, "God of heaven" (for which 4^{34} has מָרֵא שְׁמַיָּא, 5^{25}), and by אֱלָהָא עִלָּיָא or עִלָּיָא, "the Most High God," or "the Most High," more rarely by אֱלָהָא חַיָּא, "the living God," 6^{27}; חֵי עָלְמָא, "the Ever-living," 4^{31}. The simple אֱלָהָא (= הָאֱלֹהִים) occurs only in 2^{20} 5^{26}.

The course followed in other writings is not in every

case so consistent. But there was a means of guarding against possible profanation of the divine name by writing it so as merely to suggest it. The manuscripts represent יהוה by writing Yod two, three, or four times, also by modifications like יהוד and יקוק, and by putting ה׳ or ד׳ for הַשֵּׁם when pronounced in place of יהוה; אלהים appears as אלדים or אלקים, and אלהא as אלדא, אלקא. In view of this expedient, it does not mean so much that the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha should use the biblical names for God. Least of all must it be assumed that the popular usage is reflected in these books. In regard to the tetragrammaton alone can the proof be shown that—through the influence probably of Egyptian religious customs—it had really vanished from common use among the people. But we may well assume that it was not very different with regard to the other special names for God, and that apart from prayers and benedictions they were little used. Jesus Himself indicates[1] that the ordinary custom in taking an oath was not to name God, but heaven, Jerusalem, the temple, the altar, the offering, one's own head. He does not, however, sanction the opinion that, supposing an oath should have to be taken, God must be named in it, but teaches that it is better not to swear at all. Even He appears to approve the non-pronunciation of the name of God, and He at least conformed to the custom by avoiding the tetragrammaton, and preferring the substitute "Heavenly Father."

In these circumstances it must be questioned whether the Gospels, in ascribing to Jesus a frequent use of ὁ θεός, really reproduce the original form of what was said by Jesus. It is not unlikely that the evangelists set aside such terms as would have been unintelligible to the Greek and the Hellenist.

Of course, "Father in heaven" cannot in every case be inserted for "God." When, *e.g.*, mention is made of ὁ θεός alongside of ἄνθρωπος, Matt. 19[6] (Mark 10[9]), and of ὁ θεός

[1] Matt. 5[34f.] 23[16-22].

in contrast with *μαμωνᾶς*, Matt. 6^{24} (Luke 16^{13}), we must probably substitute—supposing אֱלָהָא, "God," were to be avoided—either שְׁמָא, "the Name," [1] or שְׁמַיָּא, "Heaven." [2] In some other cases it is possible to omit the divine name. When the accusation is brought against Jesus, Matt. 26^{61}, that He had said: "I am able to destroy the temple of God," there is every probability that His words had really been "this temple" (*τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον*) as in Mark 14^{58}, or "the temple" (*τὸν ναόν*) as in Matt. 27^{40} (Mark 15^{29}). Again, Jesus says, Mark 12^{25}, that they who are risen from the dead will be as "the angels in heaven" (*ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*). The Aramaic for this would be מַלְאֲכַיָּא בִּשְׁמַיָּא, which is certainly more original than the wording in Matthew (22^{30}): *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, and much more so than Luke's amplification (20^{36}): *ἰσάγγελοι καὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ*.—In order to avoid the expression "in the presence of God," we have in Luke $12^{8.9}$ 15^{10} "before the angels of God" (*ἔμπροσθεν—ἐνώπιον—τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ*). In these cases *τοῦ θεοῦ* should clearly be erased, as it partially defeats the intention of the phrase. The occurrence of *ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς* in Matt. $10^{32.33}$ as parallel to Luke $12^{8.9}$ shows how the same point may be reached in another fashion. See also under 5.

On the other hand, no scruples need attach to the use of *ὁ θεός* in the prayers which Jesus, Luke $18^{11.13}$, puts into the mouth of the Pharisee and the publican—even although, in the case of the Pharisee especially—a more elaborate form of address to God might be expected. But *ὁ θεός* must not, as is done by Delitzsch and Resch, be rendered by אֱלֹהִים, which would be a very uncommon form of address. If one assumes Hebrew as the language of the Pharisee's prayer, the word used would be אֱלָהִי, "my God"; if the publican prayed in Aramaic, the word would be אֱלָהִי. That Jesus Himself, though using Aramaic while praying on

[1] Cf. p. 182 f. [2] Cf. Fundamental Ideas, VIII. 7.

the Cross, said[1] אֵלִי, was due to the fact that His prayer was expressed in the words of a psalm. אַבָּא, "Father," was the form of address to God in prayer which was peculiar to Jesus.[2]

2. THE HIGHEST (ὕψιστος).

The divine appellations אֵל עֶלְיוֹן and עֶלְיוֹן first appear in the mouth of non-Israelites, being used by Melchizedek, Gen. $14^{18ff.}$, and by Balaam, Num. 24^{16}. The author's intention of implying that the Deity revered by these men was the true God, is by this means realised. Thereafter, in the Psalms, עֶלְיוֹן is not infrequently adopted by Israelites,[3] *e.g.* יְהוָה עֶלְיוֹן, Ps. 47^{4}; אֱלֹהִים עֶלְיוֹן, Ps. 57^{3}; אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, Ps. 78^{35}; עֶלְיוֹן, Ps. 9^{3}. The son of Sirach has אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, 46^{5} 48^{20}; while in dependence on a preceding noun, he prefers the simple עֶלְיוֹן, $41^{4.8}$ 42^{2} 44^{20} 49^{4}. The Aramaic part of Daniel has עִלָּיָא and אֱלָהָא עִלָּיָא, and also makes use of the Hebrew עֶלְיוֹן in the combination קַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין, $7^{18.22.25.27}$. Further, the "Most High," as a divine title, occurs Tob. 4^{11}, Judith 13^{8} (ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὕψιστος), Ass. Mos. 10^{7}, in all the sections of the Book of Enoch (see Charles on 99^{3}), often in the Bar. Apoc. (see Charles on 17^{1}), and repeatedly in 2 Esdras. Onkelos puts עִלָּאָה for עֶלְיוֹן in Gen. 14^{20}, Num. 24^{16}. In Rabbinic literature, on the contrary, this name for God is extraordinarily rare. The Palestinian Abbahu (about 300 A.D.) is said, b. Sot. 40^{a}, on one occasion to have styled God עִלָּאָה. There is thus good ground for the opinion that עֶלְיוֹן did not really belong to the popular speech, but characterised the language of religious poets and authors following a biblical style.

Holtzmann[4] detects in עֶלְיוֹן, as a divine title, a symptom of the "abstract colourlessness of the conception of God in the post-prophetic age" (der Epigonen), inasmuch as he holds

[1] On this verse see above, p. 53 f. [2] See above, p. 191 f.
[3] Cf. *T. K. Cheyne*, The Origin and Religious Content of the Psalter, 83 f.
[4] Lehrb. d. neutest. Theologie, i. 49.

that Judaism in its use of אֱלֹהִים, the divine title of the legalistic period, had already begun to accentuate the metaphysical idea of God to the detriment of the religious contents of the prophetic conception of God. But אֱלֹהִים is in no way the name of God which distinguished the so-called legalistic [nomistisch] period. The Priests' Code makes it quite clear that the God of Israel and of the Law chooses to be known as יהוה. And how עֶלְיוֹן or אֱלֹהִים should be more colourless than the Tetragrammaton as understood by the Jews according to Ex. 3^{14}, it would be hard to tell. Moreover, it does not agree with Holtzmann's theory of a retrogression that עֶלְיוֹן in the time of Christ should be replaced by designations like "the Holy One," "our Father in heaven," the first of which is of prophetic origin, while the second even implies an advance beyond the prophetic mode of speech.

Only once, Luke 6^{35}, is *ὕψιστος* ascribed to Jesus; and the expression there is *υἱοὶ ὑψίστου*, for which Matt. 5^{9} has *υἱοὶ θεοῦ*, and Matt. 5^{45} *υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. According to Mark 5^{7} (Luke 8^{28}), a man with an unclean spirit addressed to Jesus the words: *υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*. But Matt. 8^{29} does not give *τοῦ ὑψίστου*. Luke, however, delights in *ὕψιστος* as a name for God. He says: *υἱὸς ὑψίστου*, Gospel 1^{32}; *δύναμις ὑψίστου*, 1^{35}; *προφήτης ὑψίστου*, 1^{76}; *ὁ ὕψιστος*, Acts 7^{48}; *δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*, 16^{17}. So, too, we may suppose *υἱοὶ ὑψίστου*, Luke 6^{35}, is due to his personal predilection. The hypothesis is probable that the expression *υἱοὶ ὑψίστου* in Ps. 82^{6} LXX (Heb. 81^{6}), which, indeed, in its context has quite another sense, indicating the exalted rank of those so entitled, was in his mind when he chose this epithet. The primitive wording of the expression is preserved in its earliest form by Matthew—*υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, Aram. בְּנֵי אֲבוּכוֹן דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא.

3. THE BLESSED ONE (*ὁ εὐλογητός*).

The high priest uses the words *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ*, Mark 14^{61}, for which Matt. 26^{63} gives *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. The construction in Mark, assuming the intention was to refer to the Messiah as the Son of God, would, in fact, be more probable than that in Matthew on the lips of the high priest. "The Blessed," however, is, as a rule, in Jewish literature only added to "the Holy One" as an appendix[1] in the formula: הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא, "the Holy One, Blessed is He," Aram. קַדִּישָׁא בְּרִיךְ הוּא, on which see below. The simple הַמְבֹרָךְ, "the Blessed One," Ber. vii. 3, forms an exception. Even in Palmyra, indeed, God can be spoken of as: בָּרִיךְ שְׁמֵהּ לְעָלְמָא, "He, whose name is to be praised for ever," de Vogüé, 74, 76 (111 A.D.), 77; see also Enoch 77^{1} "the Ever-Blessed."

4. THE POWER (*ἡ δύναμις*).

The Synoptists with one consent relate (Matt. 26^{64}, Mark 14^{62}, Luke 22^{69}) that Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrim when He announced that He should sit "at the right hand of the Power" (*ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως*). In the interest of his readers Luke adds *τοῦ θεοῦ* by way of explanation, and thereby obscures, as in other cases (see p. 197), the nature of the idiom. Hegesippus (in Eusebius, ii. 23), in an allusion to this statement, attributes to James the words *ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως*, with which may be compared Acts 8^{10}, where Simon Magus is called *ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη*. The sorcerer was really spoken of as "God," and *τοῦ θεοῦ* as well as *καλουμένη* are additions due to Luke. The adjective "great" marks the "Power" as superhuman, just as "the great Holy One" in the Book of Enoch (see below) is the unique possessor of this attribute, *i.e.* God.

[1] Paul also has as an appended epithet *εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, Rom. 1^{25} 9^{5}, 2 Cor. 11^{31}.

On the other hand, the exclamation on the Cross, *ἡ δύναμίς μου ἡ δύναμίς μου*, as found in the "Gospel of Peter," is probably occasioned by Aquila's version of Ps. 22[2] (according to *Eusebius*, Demonstr. Evangel. x. 8, either *ἰσχυρέ μου* or *ἰσχύς μου*). The sense is not that the strength which was His own, but the Power which for Jesus is God, had left Him; cf. the address to God "my strength," עֻזִּי, Ps. 59[18]; see also Ex. 15[2], Ps. 46[2] 81[2]. One need not therefore assume, as Harnack[1] does, that the author had taken offence at the confession of being forsaken by God.

The statement in Matt. 14[2] (Mark 6[14]) that "the powers do work in Jesus" (*αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ*), may arise through a misunderstanding of its Aramaic antecedent: גְּבוּרָתָא מִתְעַבְדָן בֵּהּ, "mighty deeds are done by Him"; cf. Matt. 11[21. 23].

To show that *ἡ δύναμις*, in the saying of our Lord previously mentioned, really stands for "God" and is based upon גְּבוּרָתָא in Aramaic, we may cite the following instances from Jewish literature, which at the same time will indicate the extent to which the literal meaning of the term has disappeared from view. Ishmael (*c.* 100 A.D.) begins a quotation of words spoken by God with the formula: it was said "by the mouth of the Power" (מִפִּי הַגְּבוּרָה).[2] In Aboth d. R. Nathan, 37, appears the expression: it seemed good in his eyes and "in the eyes of the Power" (בְּעֵינֵי הַגְּבוּרָה). Meïr (*c.* 160 A.D.) says, b. Sot. 37[a], that, owing to the situation of the temple in his territory, Benjamin was "the host of the Power" (אוֹשְׁפִּיזָכָן לַגְּבוּרָה). An anonymous saying in Siphre[3] has in place of "God" "the Power that is above," כּוֹחוֹ שֶׁל מַעְלָה. There may also be compared Targ. Isa. 33[21], which has גְּבוּרָתָא דְיָ for the simple יהוה, and Targ. Isa. 48[13] where גְּבוּרְתִי appears for "יְמִינִי, My right hand" (*i.e.* God's).

[1] *A. Harnack*, Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus, 65.

[2] Siphre, Num. 112, ed. Friedm. 33[a]. For the same expression, see j. Sanh. 28[a].

[3] Siphre, Deut. 319, ed. Friedm. 136[b].

A kindred expression, not, however, to be found in the Gospels, may also be adduced: דַּעַת עֶלְיוֹנָה, "the Most High Knowledge" (= God), Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 89[b], Aram. דַּעֲתָא דִלְעֵיל, Jerus. I. Num. 27[5]; cf. *μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ*, Rom. 16[27].

5. THE HOLY ONE (ὁ ἅγιος).

Although *ἅγιος* as a name for God is found in the New Testament only once, 1 Pet. 1[15], where it is suggested by a quotation from the Old Testament, it does not seem irrelevant to observe that there was a divine title הַקָּדֵשׁ, "the Holiness"; see, *e.g.*, Siphre, Num. 112, ed. Friedm. 33[a].[1] Of the same nature is the much used קֻדְשָׁא בְּרִיךְ הוּא, "the Holiness, Blessed be He"; see j. Makk. 31[d], j. Bab. mez. 12[a], Ber. R. 78, Targ. Isa. 50[11], Targ. Esth. ii. 5[1], Kaddish. The Hebrew equivalent, curiously enough, is הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא, "the Holy One, Blessed be He"; see, *e.g.*, Aboth iii. 1, 2, iv. 22. The prototype of the latter appears in the biblical קָדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, *e.g.* Isa. 10[17] 49[7], and קָדוֹשׁ, Isa. 40[25], and occurs frequently also in the Book of Enoch, as "the Holy One," Enoch 1[2] 93[11]; "the Holy One who is great," 1[3] 10[1] 14[1] 25[3] 84[1] 92[2] 97[6] 98[6] 104[9].

It might readily be supposed that in the term רוּחַ קֻדְשָׁא, "the Holy Spirit," the word קֻדְשָׁא became in reality a name for God, so that *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ* would represent it more accurately than *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*. But in that case terms like רוּחַ קֻדְשָׁךְ, "Thy Holy Spirit," Ps. 51[13], רוּחָא דְקֻדְשִׁי, "My Holy Spirit," Targ. Isa. 42[1], would be impossible. And yet it must be maintained that the addition of קֻדְשָׁא is expressly meant to specify Divinity as an attribute of the Spirit. As regards content, therefore, there is no difference between "the Spirit of God" and "the Holy Spirit." Moreover, רוּחַ קֻדְשָׁא, not רוּחַ אֱלָהָא, is the common Jewish expression; and when Jesus uses *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ*, Matt. 12[28], the original would

[1] Cf. מִפּוּם קֻדְשָׁא, "from the mouth of the Holiness," Targ. Lam. 3[38].

be the Aram. בְּרוּחַ קֻדְשָׁא, unless the preference were given to the fuller form suggested by Matt. 10^{20} דְּבִשְׁמַיָּא בְּרוּחֵהּ דַּאֲבָא, "by the Spirit of My Father in heaven."

The Targums have conjoined רוּחַ, wherever in the Old Testament it is not expressly called the Spirit of God, either with קֻדְשָׁא or נְבוּאָה to make it clear what Spirit was contemplated; see רוּחַ קֻדְשִׁי for רוּחִי, Jerus. I. Gen. 6^{3}, Targ. Isa. 59^{21}, Targ. Joel 3^{2}; רוּחַ נְבוּאָתֵיהּ for רוּחוֹ, Onk. Num. 11^{29}; רוּחַ קֻדְשָׁא for רוּחַ, Onk. Gen. 45^{27} (Jerus. I. רוּחַ נְבוּאָה). In Jewish literature it is so unheard of to speak of "the Spirit" (הָרוּחַ), when the Spirit of God is meant, that the single word "spirit" would much rather be taken to mean a demon or the wind.[1] In the account of the Baptism, where Luke (3^{22}) has *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, while Matthew (3^{16}) has *πνεῦμα θεοῦ*, and Mark (1^{10}) *τὸ πνεῦμα*, it is only the first that would be probable in a Hebrew primitive gospel as רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ; while דִּבְרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ הָרוּחַ [2] based on Mark, as proposed by Resch in his, would be quite impossible. Resch's Hebrew in (2^{8}): וַיַּרְא אֶת־הָרוּחַ יוֹרֶדֶת בִּדְמוּת יוֹנָה, could at best only signify: "and he saw the wind coming down in the form of a dove." Again, in Matt. 4^{1} *τὸ πνεῦμα* cannot be simply reproduced in Hebrew. What is offered by Resch (2^{10}): אָז הוֹבִל יֵשׁוּעַ הַמִּדְבָּרָה בְּרוּחַ, would have to be translated, "then was he carried into the wilderness in spirit." In the same way *ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία*, Matt. 12^{31}, is unsuitable on the lips of Jesus, and *τοῦ ἁγιοῦ*, as in v.[32], must be supplied. Similarly *ἐν πνεύματι*, Matt. 22^{43}, should be supplemented as in Mark 12^{36} *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ*.

[1] It may perhaps be mentioned that even in recent times a missionary evoked the scorn of the Jews by using the term הָרוּחַ without qualification in his address.

[2] Such translations could not be avoided by Franz Delitzsch, as he had to copy the idiom of the Synoptic texts with all their variations; but in a professing Hebrew original they are intolerable.

6. THE MERCIFUL ONE.

Only in Rom. 9^{16} *ὁ ἐλεῶν θεός* does "the Merciful" appear in the New Testament as a designation of God; cf. 3 Macc. 5^{7} *ὁ ἐλεήμων θεός*. The son of Sirach (50^{19}) already had the simple רַחוּם as a name for God. On the inscriptions of Palmyra, רַחֲמָנָא occurs as an epithet applied to deity (de Vogüé, 75, 77, 79); and in Jewish literature it often appears as an independent title, *e.g.* j. Sabb. 3^{b} (Simeon ben Yokhai, *c.* 140 A.D.). See also the prayers, רַחֲמָנָא עֲנֵינָן and רַחֲמָנָא אִדְּכַר, Roman Machzor, for the days before New Year. It was thus an obviously natural thought that the children of the Heavenly Father ought to be "merciful," to be in accord with the fact that God is "merciful," *οἰκτίρμων*, Luke 6^{36}. Similar admonitions are, accordingly, often given by the Rabbis; see, *e.g.*, j. Meg. 75^{c} כְּמָא דַאֲנַן מְרַחֲמִין בִּשְׁמַיָּא כֵּן תְּהוֹן רַחֲמָנִין בְּאַרְעָא, "according as We are moved to mercy in heaven, so should ye be merciful on earth"; cf. Jerus. I. Lev. 22^{18}, where the protasis runs: הֵיכְמָא דַאֲבוּנָן רַחֲמָן בִּשְׁמַיָּא, "as our Father is merciful in heaven."

VIII. EVASIVE OR PRECAUTIONARY MODES OF REFERRING TO GOD.

1. THE VOICE.

To the evangelic narrative and not to the words of Jesus belong the expressions: *φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Matt. 3^{17} (Mark 1^{11}, Luke 3^{22} *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*), and *φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης*, Matt. 17^{5} (Mark 9^{7}, Luke 9^{35}). The mention of heaven and of the cloud, in these cases, is due to the fact that, immediately before the voice is alluded to, the heaven and the cloud are involved in the context. Luke speaks only of a "voice" (*φωνή*), Acts $10^{13.\,15}$ $11^{7.\,9}$ and in 7^{31}, after the biblical

manner of a "voice of the Lord" (*φωνὴ κυρίου*). It is only in John 12^{28} and Rev. $10^{4.8}$ 14^{13} that the source of the voice *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* is not suggested by the context.

This "voice" is heard when God is said to speak audibly to the sense of hearing. It is obviously a means of avoiding the notion that God should speak without any medium in the world. And hence it is not meant that the "voice" is any peculiar "being" or mediating hypostasis.

Nor again is any idea entertained of an imperfect type of divine revelation. The phrase is merely precautionary. Its aim is to indicate that the incident is miraculous, and it does not warrant any direct inference as to the nature of the supramundane God.

The expression appears first of all Dan. 4^{28} קָל מִן שְׁמַיָּא נָפַל, "a voice fell from heaven"; see also Bar. Apoc. 13^{1} "a voice came from on high" (Syr. קלא אתא מן מרומא), cf. 22^{1}. Instead of the simple קָל, later Jewish literature inserts the fuller בַּת קָלָא, Hebr. בַּת קוֹל, which, however, means no more than "sound, voice,"[1] though, as a rule, it causes the omission of "the heaven." The ordinary form here is: נְפַקַת בַּת קָלָא, Hebr. קוֹל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "a voice came forth," the mention of heaven being unusual, as b. Sanh. 11^{a} נִתְּנָה בַּת קוֹל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "a voice was given from heaven." In this literature also the voice was not at the first regarded as an inferior form of revelation,[2] since we have here to do with the one and only mode of divine intimation. The endowment with the Holy Spirit, in the sense of the old prophecy, was something more exalted,[3] only because the divine element in it assumed a permanent relation to the inner life of an individual, and did not make itself heard merely from without and at intervals.

[1] See my article "Bath Kol," PRE ii.[3] 443 f., where details are given to show that two species of the voice must be distinguished, (1) one which was really and miraculously caused by God directly, (2) one which was a human utterance, heard by some chance, to which was attributed the significance of a divine intimation.

[2] Incorrectly advanced in my "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 58, note 1.

[3] See the Baraitha, b. Sot. 48^{b}; j. Sot. 24^{b}.

2. SWEARING BY HEAVEN.

Swearing by heaven, *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, Matt. 5^{34} 23^{22}, is looked upon by Jesus as equivalent to swearing by God. He thus implies that a real name of God was being intentionally avoided, whenever the throne of God was named instead of God Himself, but not that "heaven" itself is meant as a divine name. Jesus affirms that an oath of such a kind is still an oath, which, if once taken, must be kept (23^{22}), though it is better to avoid it in general (5^{34}). Against the form of the expression as such, Jesus urges no objection.

In Siphre, Deut. 304, ed. Friedm. 147[a],[1] הַשָּׁמַיִם appears as an asseveration. As a matter of fact, swearing in the name of "heaven and earth," according to Shebu. iv. 13, is not regarded as the oath of a witness; hence refusal on the latter's part to give evidence is not regarded as a culpable offence. On the position of Judaism in relation to oaths, see "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 60 ff., 68 ff.

3. REWARD, TREASURES IN HEAVEN.

Jesus speaks of a reward *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, Matt. 5^{12} (Luke 6^{23} *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*), of treasures *ἐν οὐρανῷ*, Matt. 6^{20} (Luke 12^{33} *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*), 19^{21} (Mark 10^{21}, Luke 18^{22} *ἐν οὐρανοῖς*). Here "in heaven" stands for "with God"; cf. Matt. 6^{1} *παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*; and Jesus merely means that the recompense of completed work or the compensation for what is sacrificed in this world, is made ready by God even now, in so far as the "theocracy" is assuredly destined to come for the righteous. Any mystical pre-existence of "reward" or "treasure" is in no way contemplated. Cf. above, p. 129 f.

In agreement with texts of Scripture like Ps. 31^{20}

[1] See also *E. Landau*, Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott (1888), 16.

מָה רַב טוּבְךָ אֲשֶׁר צָפַנְתָּ לִירֵאֶיךָ, "how great is Thy goodness which Thou hast laid up for them that fear Thee," and Prov. 2^7 יִצְפֹּן לַיְשָׁרִים תּוּשִׁיָּה, "He layeth up salvation for the upright,"[1] Tobit (4^{14}) speaks of divine remuneration for him who pays wages when they are due, and (4^9) of a "goodly provision' (*θέμα ἀγαθόν*)[2] which man by the exercise of benevolence makes for himself against the day of necessity. "He who practises righteousness, lays up (*θησαυρίζει*) for himself with the Lord 'life,'" Ps. Sol. 9^9. Bar. Apoc. 14^{12} says that the pious forsake this present age without fear, because they have with God "a provision of works, kept in treasure-chambers" (Syr. חילא דעבדא דנטיר באוצרא). See also 2 Esdr. 7^{77} "est tibi thesaurus operum repositus apud altissimum" (Syr. איתהו לך—אוצרא דעובדא דסים לות מרימא), cf. 8^{33}. It is to be observed, in these cases, that the treasure is laid up "with God," which also confirms the view that "in heaven" in the words of Jesus is a mere synonym for this expression.

Later Jewish literature also affords in this connexion the expression: סְגֻלַּת מִצְוֹת וּמַעֲשִׂים טוֹבִים, "to lay up the fulfilment of commandments and good deeds";[3] see Ber. R. 9; Vay. R. 4; Deb. R. 1. According to Peah i. 1 (anonym.), there are certain pious services, the interest of which is enjoyed in this age, while the capital (קֶרֶן) remains over for the future age.[4] King Monobazos (*c.* 10 A.D.) retorts to his relatives, who find fault with his beneficence:[5] "My fathers gathered treasures

[1] See also Targ. Isa. 33^6 לְדַחֲלַיָּא דְיָי אוֹצַר טוּבְיֵה עֲתִיד, "to them that fear God is the treasure of His goodness appointed."

[2] Syr. סימתא רבתא, Aram. דרופתק טב, for which read הופתק טב (*ὑποθήκη*), Hebr. עושר ואוצרות כסף וזהב.

[3] See the definition of סְגֻלָּה Pes. Rabb. 43[a]: "To him who possesses it, it is disagreeable to disturb it: if he is forced by need to deduct from it, then he is ever busy to make up what was taken away." Hence סְגֻלָּה is an inalienable capital.

[4] For the idea of reward in Rabbinic doctrine, see *F. Weber*, Jüdische Theologie[2] (1897), 279 ff., 302 ff. That there also exist in it opinions which tend to mitigate the insistent attitude in the idea of recompense, will be shown elsewhere.

[5] j. Peah 15[b]; b. Bab. b. 11[a].

upon earth; I, in heaven: my fathers gathered treasures which yield no interest; I, such as yield interest: my fathers gathered them into a place over which the hand of man has power; I, into a place over which man's hand has no power: they gathered gold, I gather souls; they gathered for others, I for myself; they for this age, I for the age to come." All these passages merely have in view some form of book-keeping on the part of God. The good words recorded by Him are merely so many claims to future recompense. Even the Targ. Isa. 24[16] is not, as Meyer[1] holds, intended to suggest things really existent in the other world. According to the Targumist, the prophet says: רָז אֲנָר לְצַדִּיקַיָּא אִתְחֲזִי לִי רָז פּוּרְעָנוּת לְרַשִּׁיעַיָּא אִתְגְּלִי לִי, "the mystery of a recompense for the righteous was revealed to me, the mystery of a chastisement for the wicked was made manifest to me." That is, the prophet learned what the things are which the righteous and the wicked have to expect as reward and punishment.

In contrast with this, a celestial pre-existence of the reward might *possibly* be presupposed in Shem. R. 45, where God is represented as having shown to Moses "all the treasure-chambers of reward" (כָּל אוֹצָרוֹת שֶׁל מַתַּן שָׂכָר) prepared for the righteous; and also in Shir. R. 7[14], Deb. R. 7, where Abba bar Kahana (*c.* 300)[2] represents God as addressing the Jews thus: "Preserve ye yourselves by fulfilling the law and by good works, and I will preserve for you treasure-chambers overflowing with all the blessings of the world";[3] of the same nature is also Targ. Jerus. II. Num. 23[33] טוּבֵיכוֹן צַדִּיקַיָּא מָה אֲנָר טָב מְתַקַּן לְכוֹן נַּבֵּי אֲבוּכוֹן דִּבְשְׁמַיָּא לְעָלְמָא דְאָתֵי, "Blessed are ye righteous! what a noble reward is prepared for you with your Father in heaven for the age to come!" Still, in this case, the other sense is possible.

[1] Jesu Muttersprache, 83.

[2] Cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. pal. Am. ii. 499 f.

[3] For the term אוצר זכיות, "treasure of merits," *Charles* in Bar. Apoc. 14[12] cites Sabb. 31[b]. He is misled, however, perhaps through *Weber's* Jüd. Theologie, 279.

4. WRITTEN IN HEAVEN.

The names of the disciples are written *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (*ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*), Luke 10^{20}, *i.e.* the disciples as such are known to God and are kept in remembrance. "In heaven" stands for "with God." The allusion is to the "book of God" in Ex. $32^{32f.}$, and the "book of the living" in Ps. 69^{28}, in which all the righteous are enrolled; cf. Isa. 4^3, Dan. 12^1.[1] Of this the Book of Enoch also speaks, 47^3 104^1: "your names stand inscribed before the majesty of the Exalted"; 108^3 "the book of life and the books of the holy ones." Jubil. 30^{20} has: "he is entered in the heavenly tablets as a friend and an upright man"; cf. 30^{22}. The Targum to the prophets supplements Isa. 4^3 in the sense in which Jesus also appears to have interpreted the text, making the life הַחַיִּים to be "the eternal life" (חַיֵּי עָלְמָא). The school of Shammai would seem to have spoken of a registration unto life and unto death,[2] b. R. h. S. 16^b; but in Tos. Sanh. xiii. 3 the requisite terms for this sense are wanting. On the other hand, Yokhanan[3] (*c.* 260) takes note of three "lists" (פִּינְקָסָיוֹת)—one for the righteous, one for the wicked, and the other for an intermediate class—into which, as it seems, names are from year to year entered afresh at the beginning of the year.

5. BEFORE THE ANGELS, BEFORE GOD.

Over the sinner that repents there is joy *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ*, Luke 15^{10}, or *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, ibid. v.[7]. By that is meant that there will be joy in the presence of God, or, strictly: God will rejoice.

[1] This book resembles the list of citizens among the nations and cities on earth, and must be kept distinct from the book of good and evil deeds; see *R. H. Charles* on Enoch 47^3.

[2] See *Bacher*, Agada d. Tann. i. 18 f.

[3] j. R. h. S. 57^a; cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. p. Am. i. 331.

The Son of Man will acknowledge His confessors and disown those who have denied Him, *ἔμπροσθεν (ἐνώπιον) τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ*, Luke 12[8f.]. The reproduction in Matt. 10[32f.] *ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, shows what is really meant, namely, an acknowledgment in the presence of God, for whom the angels are substituted merely to avoid the use of the divine name. In Jewish literature this idiom is unfamiliar. It is exceedingly probable that it should not be assumed as falling from the lips of Jesus either, and that it was Luke who inserted "the angels" in place of a term which appeared to him less intelligible. In his source he will have found the expression "before Heaven" (Judæan קֳדָם שְׁמַיָּא, Galil. קֳמֵי שְׁמַיָּא), an echo of which occurs Luke 15[7] "in heaven." The Palestinian Talmud Kidd. 64[c] shows that קֳמֵי שְׁמַיָּא was in actual use.

Even the sparrows are not forgotten "in the sight of God" (*ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*), Luke 12[6], *i.e.* God does not forget them. To get the words of Jesus here, *ὁ θεός* would have to be converted into "heaven," or, following the parallel in Matt. 10[29], into "your Heavenly Father." The former is recommended by the saying which shows some affinity with Matthew's mode of expressing the idea: צִפּוֹר מִבַּלְעֲדֵי שְׁמַיָּא לָא יָבְרָא, "not a bird perishes apart from Heaven," j. Shebi. 38[d]; cf. Ber. R. 79. Luke's form of the expression is recalled by the dictum of Ishmael ben Elisha (*c.* 110 A.D.):[1] "there is joy in the presence of 'the Place' (יֵשׁ שִׂמְחָה לִפְנֵי הַמָּקוֹם), when those who provoke Him to anger disappear from the world." So, too, it is said, Siphre, ed. Friedm. 139[a]: "when 'the Place' (הַמָּקוֹם) judges the peoples, there is joy in His presence (שִׂמְחָה הֱוֵא לְפָנָיו); but when He judges Israel, it is, as it were, with regret (כִּבְיָכוֹל יֵשׁ תָּהוּת לְפָנָיו)." "There is no forgetfulness before the throne of Majesty," according to a saying of Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 250 A.D.).[2] In j. Maas. sh. 56[d] the question is

[1] Siphre, Num. 117, ed. Friedm. 37[a]; cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. Tann. i. 256.
[2] b. Ber. 32[b]; cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. pal. Am. i. 397.

asked: "is there then sleep before God?" and Midr. Ps. 121[3] positively affirms: "there is neither sleep nor sitting 'on high' (לְמַעְלָה)." In Ab. v. 2 it is pointed out how God deferred the Flood "in order to show how great is longsufferance 'in His presence.'" Speaking generally, the accomplishment of actions is attested or denied *before* God, when those activities are in question which God Himself either does or does not do.

Even "volition" might not be directly predicated of God. It is true, Luke 12[32] has: *εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν*, but Matt. 18[14] gives: *οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, "it is not the will of (before) your Father in heaven." Instead of "it has pleased Thee," Jesus says in addressing God, Matt. 11[26] (Luke 10[21]): *οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου*, "so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight." These are not Old Testament usages. The last-named instance recalls the formula often used in prayer: יְהִי רָצוֹן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ, "may it be well-pleasing in Thy sight"; see, *e.g.*, j. Ber. 7[d]; Aram. יְהֵא רַעֲוָה מְקַמֵּי קֻדְשָׁא, Targ. Cant. 7[14]; יְהֵא רַעֲוָה מִן קֳדָם יְיָ, "may it be well-pleasing before the Holiness, Blessed be He," Koh. R. 3[2].[1] One may also compare Onk. Gen. 28[17] אַתְרָא דִרְעָוָה בֵּיהּ מִן קֳדָם יְיָ, "a place, which has regard from before Jhvh"; and Numb. 14[8] אִם רַעֲוָא בָּנָא קֳדָם יְיָ, "if we find favour before Jhvh."

To the expression of Matt. 18[14] there corresponds in the Targums: רַעֲוָא קֳדָם יְיָ לְ, "it is the will of (before) Jhvh, to . . ." This phrase is used to replace the Hebr. חָפֵץ יהוה, "Jhvh was pleased to," Targ. Judg. 13[23], 1 Sam. 2[25], and Isa. 53[10], which has the form: מִן קֳדָם יְיָ הֲוָת רַעֲוָא לְ. Though not suggested by the Hebrew text, it appears in Ezek. 1[25]. Its antiquity appears from its use in 1 Macc. 3[60] *ὡς δ' ἂν ᾖ θέλημα ἐν οὐρανῷ*, Syr. איך דאית צבינא קדם עמורא דשמיא, "as may be the decision before Him who dwells in heaven."

[1] According to Midrash Khamesh Megilloth, ed. Salonica, 1593, not in ed. Pesaro. 1519, nor Venice, 1545.

As divine honours are rendered to a king, so it comes to pass that in Egypt men spoke only "in the presence of the king," not "to" him.[1] One speaks "before" the king (לִפְנֵי, Aram. קֳדָם), also in Esth. 1^{16} 7^{9} 8^{3}, Dan. $2^{9.\ 10.\ 11.\ 27.\ 36}$ 5^{17}. That prayer is offered "before" God is stated more frequently in the younger books of the Old Testament than in the earlier books. And consistently with this tendency, the Targums never represent man as speaking "to," but "before" (קֳדָם) God; men blaspheme and provoke to anger not "Him," but "in His presence."[2] Hence it is not surprising that it is also said that man sins not "against" God, but "before" God. In Gen. 20^{9}, which treats of a matter between two men, the Hebr. לְ חָטָא is rendered in the LXX by *ἁμαρτάνειν εἰς*, and in Onkelos by לְ חָב; but in Ex. 32^{33}, where the sin is against God, the same Hebr. לְ חָטָא is rendered in the LXX Alex. *ἁμαρτάνειν ἐνώπιον*, and Onkelos קֳדָם חָב. Daniel (6^{23}) affirms that he has done no wrong "before" the king. According to j. Sanh. 28^{b}, King Ahab complained to Levi, the Amora, whose teaching was prejudicial to the character of that king: מָה חֲטִית לָךְ וּמָה סְרַחִית קָדָמָךְ, "what is my sin against thee, and what ill have I done before thee?" This reverent mode of address is here used to an ordinary man. With respect to God, the prayer מַחֵי וּמַפֵּי[3] has, as a matter of course: חָטֵינָן לָקָמָךְ, "we have sinned before Thee." It is different in the statement of Ps. 51^{6} לְךָ לְבַדְךָ חָטָאתִי וְהָרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ עָשִׂיתִי; for here בְּעֵינֶיךָ goes with הָרַע, and the rendering should be: "against Thee alone have I sinned, and that which is evil in thine eyes I have committed." Luke, however, conforms to the usage under consideration, when in his Gospel $15^{18.\ 21}$ the prodigal son says to his father: "I have sinned even against heaven (*εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*) and *before thee* (*ἐνώπιόν σου*)." The motive here is not that the father in the

[1] *A. Erman*, Ägypten, 109.

[2] *M. Ginsburger*, Die Anthropomorphismen in den Targumim, 22 f., 32 f., 41; *G. Dalman*, Der Gottesname Adonaj, 57.

[3] Seder Rab Amram, ii. 21^{b}.

parable stands for God, but that the son speaks with befitting reverence towards his father. Luke will thus have interchanged the prepositions εἰς and ἐνώπιον for reasons of style.

6. BOUND, LOOSED IN HEAVEN.

What the disciples of Jesus bind upon earth is reckoned "in heaven" also as bound; what they loose upon earth is also loosed "in heaven," Matt. 18[18]. The same is said in regard to Peter, Matt. 16[19] (with ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). The antithesis is doubtless here intended to lie between the disciples, or Peter, on the one side, and on the other [not heaven, but] *God*. Even when Jesus says that He has power "on earth" (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) to forgive sins, Matt. 9[6] (Mark 2[10], Luke 5[24]), the meaning is that He does so here on earth just in the same way as is done by God in heaven.

With the foregoing use of the phrase "in heaven," the Rabbis are not always in agreement when they speak of "the court of justice which is on high," בֵּית דִּין שֶׁלְּמַעְלָן, as, *e.g.*, in j. Ber. 14[c]; j. R. h. S. 58[b]; j. Bikk. 64[c]. Often, indeed, that is also a mere phrase intended to avoid naming God;[1] but sometimes, too, the idea entertained is, that God with the angels forms a real court of justice. The principle, which Holtzmann in his Commentary on Matt. 16[18f.][2] refers to as generally acknowledged, that the heavenly Sanhedrim will confirm the conclusions of the earthly, does not, however, hold so extensively. Certain specified matters, such as the regulation of the Calendar, have been entrusted by God to the supreme council in Israel, and by this agreement He too appears to be bound.[3] In the Targum Cant. 8[13] God says to the community of Israel: "let me hear the Law, the sound of thy words, when thou sittest to acquit and to condemn;

[1] Cf. *e.g.* Midr. Ps. 57[2] where הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא takes the place of בֵּית דִּין שֶׁלְּמַעְלָן, j. Ber. 14[c].

[2] See also *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 50.

[3] j. R. h. S. 57[b]; Pesikt. 53[b] f.; cf. j. Ber. 14[c].

and I will consent to all that thou doest." That does not mean that in all things God subordinates His resolution to that of the community of Israel; it is merely the interpretation and application of the Law that He has placed in their hands.

According to Tanna Eliyyahu rabba 29,[1] a ban pronounced on earth has even enhanced validity before God. It is there said, "to any one who is excommunicated 'below' (מִלְּמַטָּה) for *one* day, even if he has been freed from the ban, there is 'on high' (מִלְּמַעְלָה) no release for seven days." Here "on high" quite corresponds to the expression in Matthew. On the other hand, "Heaven" stands directly for "God" in the epithet מְנֻדֶּה לְשָׁמַיִם, "banned by Heaven," b. Pes. 113b.

This recognition on God's part of earthly decisions of justice, attested by the Rabbis, is left far behind when the belief is expressed that in certain circumstances the divine authority must even give way before that of the pious person. In dependence upon such biblical passages as 2 Sam. 23[3], Job 22[28], Eccles. 8[4. 5], it is made out, j. Taan. 67a (cf. b. Sabb. 63a), that "the Holy One, Blessed be He, makes His determination invalid, if it contradict the determination of a pious person"; b. Mo. k. 16b,[2] "I, God, rule over men; who rules over Me? The pious—for I enact and he annuls," and j. Taan. 67a "Even if I (God) say thus, and thou sayest otherwise, then thy word is valid and Mine invalid."

The terms δέειν and λύειν used in Matthew can be referred only to אֲסַר and שְׁרָא in Aramaic. As may be seen j. Ber. 5b, *e.g.*, these are the technical forms for the verdict of a doctor of the law who pronounces something as "bound" (אָסִיר, j. Ber. 6c), *i.e.* "forbidden," or else as "loosed" (שְׁרֵי, j. Sanh. 28a), *i.e.* "permitted"—not, of course, in virtue of his own absolute authority, but in conformity with his knowledge of the oral law. Consequently the statement of

[1] Cf. Yalk. Shimeoni, i. 745.
[2] Cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Am. ii. 127.

Jesus would mean that His disciples—in virtue of their knowledge of His oral teaching—will be able to give an authoritative decision in regard to what the adherents of the theocracy may do and may not do. To this it must, however, be objected, (1) that Matthew can hardly have understood the saying of our Lord in that sense, because δέειν and λύειν do not in his Greek mean "forbid" and "permit"; and (2) that the context, at least in Matt. 18[18], has in view an exclusion from the community. If the supposition be rejected that Matthew has misunderstood the statement and has set it in a connection originally foreign to it, the only remaining option is that the terms "bind" and "loose" were really taken from the aforesaid use of the legal schools, but that here no emphasis falls on "permitting" and "forbidding" as such, but only on the final significance universally attaching to the word of him who has authority to "permit" and "forbid." The context goes on to say in what direction that verdict is regarded as being operative.

The thought is similar to that associated with the figure of the keeper of the keys. Isa. 22[22] shows how Shebna [for the time being] has the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; if he opens, none shuts; if he shuts, then no one opens. That does not mean that Shebna is the palace doorkeeper, but that he is comptroller of the household, to whom the management of all the king's domestic concerns is entrusted.[1] In allusion to this passage, it is said in Rev. 3[7f.] of Christ, that He has the key of David, and that He, as rightful possessor of this key, has power to open and to shut; in virtue of this authority He can pronounce sentence upon the status and value of any community, while no other power whatever can avail in opposition. In the same way הַפּוֹסֵק,

[1] So, too, in the old story, according to which the priests of the temple then doomed to destruction threw the keys towards the heavens, because they had been unworthy keepers, it is not the opening and shutting that are in consideration, but the general supervision of the sanctuary. See Bar. Apoc. 10[18], the rest of the words of Baruch, 4[3f.]; b. Taan. 29[a]; j. Shek. 50[a]; Vay. R. 19.

"the locksmith," 2 Kings 24^{14}, suggests in Siphre, Deut. 311, ed. Friedm. 138[a], the teacher of the law: "all sit before him and learn from him; if he has opened no one shuts,"—*i.e.* his instruction has indisputable authority. In the same sense, Peter, Matt. 16^{19}, has the keys of the theocracy, and, as keeper of the keys, is the fully authorised steward of the house of God upon earth. Since, moreover, it is the community of Jesus that is here concerned, in which Peter is to exercise this office, and as no sort of limitation to a defined sphere is indicated, it follows necessarily that the control of teaching and of discipline are regarded as entrusted to him. Peter had just shown that he understood his Master better than the others. He, therefore, shall it be, who will one day assume in the fellowship that position which Jesus then occupied in relation to His disciples. Again, in Matt. 18^{18} the same plenary power is vested in the disciples collectively, in the case when the special application of that authority is made in respect of the discipline of the community. Accordingly, the application which is given in John 20^{23} to this saying is not unwarranted. For exclusion from the community on account of some offence includes the "retaining" of the sins; the readmission of the sinner includes the "remission" of his sins. The only remark to be made here is that the term *κρατεῖν* in John has no Jewish parallel. שִׂים עַל, which Salkinson puts for it, means, according to Num. 12^{11} "to impute something (as a sin) to any one." In Delitzsch, too, הָאֲשִׁים is merely a make-shift.

That שְׁרָא, "to loose," if not the companion term, can also be used figuratively in various connections in Jewish Aramaic, may also be demonstrated here.

(*a*) "To ban" is in Hebr. נָדָה, "to loose" from the ban Hebr. הַתִּיר, Mo. kat. iii. 1, 2; Aram. נְדִי, חֲרֵם (אַחֲרֵם) and שְׁרָא, j. Mo. kat. 81[d]. In that passage Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 260) calls out to some fruit-stealers: "Let those people be banned (מַחֲרְמִין)!" They reply: "Let that man be banned!" He

hastens after them and entreats them: "Loose me (שְׁרוֹן לִי)!" They reply: "Loose us, and we will loose thee."

(*b*) "To render spellbound" through sorcery is אֲסַר, b. Sabb. 81[b], and correspondingly "to loose," *i.e.* "to set the spellbound person free," is שְׁרָא, ibid. and j. Sanh. 25[d]. F. C. Conybeare[1] is of opinion that it was from the phraseology of magic that Jesus selected His terms, and that the power transmitted by Him to the disciples was like a magical influence, supposed to confer ability to work miracles. But the context in Matthew, like everything else we know about Jesus, is opposed to this supposition.

(*c*) "To loose" (שְׁרָא) can also be said for "to forgive." According to Midr. Ps. 19[7],[2] David said to God: "the transgressions wherein I have trespassed before Thee, I pray Thee, forgive me" (תִּשְׁרֵי לִי)![3] And the answer received was: "lo! it is forgiven unto thee; lo! it is remitted unto thee (הָא שְׁרֵי לָךְ וְהָא שְׁבִיק לָךְ)." The month Tishri is called by this name, according to Vay. R. 29, because at that time God "forgives, remits, expiates" (תִּשְׁרֵי תִּשְׁבּוֹק תְּכַפֵּר) the sins of His people. Those who have beaten Tarphon (*c.* 110), not knowing who he was, call to him, j. Shebi. 35[d]: שְׁרִי לַן, "forgive us!" Nachman bar Yizkhak (*c.* 350) quotes b. Yom. 86[a] the Babylonian phrase: שְׁרָא לֵהּ מָרֵיהּ דְּפִלָנְיָא[4], "forgive him, O Lord of such an one!" In Jerus. I. Num. 14[18] God is called שָׁרֵי לְחוֹבִין, "One who forgives the guilty."

7. HEAVEN.

It may be doubted whether Luke ever consciously used "Heaven," meaning "God." The solitary passage which can be adduced in support of that view is Luke 15[18. 21] ἥμαρτον

[1] Jew. Quart. Rev. ix. 468 ff.

[2] The saying is here attributed to Simeon ben Yokhai (*c.* 140 A.D.), but in Vay. R. 5 to Khoni, in b. Sanh. 107[a] to Dosithai.

[3] This appears only in ed. Buber, not in ed. Const. 1512, Venice, 1546.

[4] So it should be read instead of לפלניא in the text.

εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, assuming the translation to be: "I have sinned *against* Heaven and before Thee." As has been said above, under 5, we should expect preferably "*before* Heaven" to have been said by Jesus. Still it may be that this was the original, and that *εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* should mean for Luke, "even unto Heaven."

The examples already given, under 5, of the corresponding rabbinic usage may here be supplemented. We have the phrase: הֵטִיחַ דְּבָרִים כְּלַפֵּי מַעְלָה, "to make reproaches towards heaven," said, b. Ber. 31[b], b. Taan. 25[a], to have been used by Eleazar ben Pedat (*c.* 290).[1] The Babylonian Nachman (*c.* 300) made bold to say:[2] "Even insolence in the face of heaven (כְּלַפֵּי שְׁמַיָּא) has its use"; cf. Targ. Eccl. 7[9] מֵימַר פְּתָנֵמֵי סַרְבָנוּתָא כְּלַפֵּי שְׁמַיָּא, "to speak words of insubordination in the face of heaven." The Palestinian Khanina (*c.* 210)[3] distinguishes sins as "upon the earth" (בָּאָרֶץ), or "in heaven" (בַּשָּׁמַיִם), *i.e.* against men or against God.

In all probability Jesus made a more extensive use of שְׁמַיָּא as a divine name than the Gospels would lead us to suppose. This need not seem surprising. The antiquity of the popular custom to which He adhered, which arose probably through the impulse of Greek influence, is proved, so far as Hebraists are concerned, by Dan. 4[23], 1 Macc. 3[18. 19. 50. 60] 4[10. 24. 55] 12[15]; and for Hellenists by 2 Macc. 7[11] 8[20] 9[4. 20]. The cases are not here distinguished, where "heaven" must necessarily stand for the Person of "God," and where phrases like "to heaven," "from heaven," are due to the desire not to name the Person of God in any way. Examples of the use of שָׁמַיִם for "God" in the rabbinic literature, especially the Mishna, have been collected by *E. Schürer*, Jahrbb. f. prot. Theol. 1876, 166–187, and by *E. Landau*, Die dem

[1] Cf. the expressions הִקְפִּיל כְּלַפֵּי לְמַעְלָן, "to direct one's prayer on high (to God)," j. Ber. 8[b]; הִסְפִּיק כְּלַפֵּי מַעְלָה, "to direct one's look upwards (to God)," R. h. S. iii. 8.

[2] b. Sanh. 105[a].

[3] Koh. R. 9. 12; cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. pal. Am. i. 10.

Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott (1888), 14–28. Here we may name such cases only as have clearly put "heaven" in place of the divine name. Composite expressions of this kind are: מוֹרָא שָׁמַיִם, "the fear of God," Ab. i. 3; מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, "the sovereignty of God," Ber. ii. 2; שֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, "the name of God," Sanh. vi. 4; דִּינֵי שָׁמַיִם, "the decrees of God," b. Bab. k. 55[b]; רַחֲמֵי שָׁמַיָּא, "the mercy of God," Jerus. I. Num. 26[19]; מֵימְרָא דִּשְׁמַיָּא, "the word of God" (God), Targ. Eccl. 4[4] 11[3]; and in the prayer תִּשְׁתַּבַּח אֲסוּתָא.[1] Prepositions are conjoined with שָׁמַיִם in בִּידֵי שָׁמַיִם, "by the hand of God," Sanh. ix. 6; לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, "for God" (in the name of God),[2] Ab. ii. 2; לְשָׁמַיִם, "for God," Men. xiii. 1, j. Ned. 37[a]; קֳמֵי שְׁמַיָּא, "before God," j. Kidd. 64[c]. "Heaven" is the subject of the verb in שְׁמַיָּא מְעַבֵּד נִפִּין, "God does wonders," j. Taan. 66[d].

8. FROM HEAVEN.

In Matt. 21[25] (Mark 11[30], Luke 20[4]) Jesus requires an answer to the question whether the baptism of John was "from heaven" (*ἐξ οὐρανῶν*) or "of men" (*ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*). Of the same nature are John 3[27] "to have been given from heaven," *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; 19[11] "to be given 'from above,' *ἄνωθεν*"; 3[7] "to be born 'from above'"; 3[31] "to come 'from above,' to come 'from heaven'"; Jas. 1[17] 3[15] "to come 'from above.'" What is meant throughout is derivation from God, though it must be granted that "heaven" did not in these cases stand pure and simply for the divine name (cf. above, p. 92).

Beside these instances may be set the following: *ἔχομεν τὴν ἐξ οὐρανῶν βοηθίαν*, "we have the help which comes from heaven," 1 Macc. 12[15], cf. 3[19]; *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ταῦτα κέκτημαι*, "from heaven have I received these as my possession," 2 Macc. 7[11]; אֵין תּוֹרָה מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "the law is not from heaven,"

[1] Seder Rab Amram, i. 52[b].

[2] Cf. *G. A. Deissmann*, Bibelstudien, 143 ff.; Neue Bibelstudien, 24 ff.

Sanh. x. 1; יְהֵא שְׁלָמָא רַבָּא מִן שְׁמַיָּא, "may there be (come) peace abounding from heaven," Kaddish;[1] יְקוּם פֻּרְקָן מִן שְׁמַיָּא, "may redemption arise from heaven," in the prayer that begins with these words:[2] אֵין מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם מוֹחֲלִין לָהֶן, "there is no forgiveness from heaven for them," Tos. Shebu. iii. 1 (Joshua ben Khananya, *c.* 130 A.D.); תֵּיתֵי עֲלָךְ אוֹכָחְתָּא מִן שְׁמַיָּא, "there shall come upon thee correction from heaven," Targ. Eccl. 7[9]; אִתְיְהֵב לֵיהּ מִן שְׁמַיָּא, "it was given to him from heaven," ibid. 8[15]; מִן שְׁמַיָּא אִתְגְּזַר, "it was decreed from heaven," ibid. 9[2]; אִשָּׁה שֶׁהִקְנוּ לוֹ מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "a wife whom men have assigned to him from heaven,"[3] Ned. x. 6. The use of "above" in the same sense is closely related; examples: מַזָּלָא דִּלְעֵילָּא, "the destiny which is above," Targ. Eccl. 3[9]; מֵימְרָא דִּלְעֵיל, "the word which is above," Jerus. I. Lev. 24[12]; דַּעַת עֶלְיוֹנָה, "the knowledge which is above," Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 89[b], Aram. דְּעָתָא דִּלְעֵיל, Jerus. I. Num. 27[5]; כּוֹחוֹ שֶׁל מַעְלָה, "the power that is above," Siphre, ed. Friedm. 137[a]; עֵינוֹ שֶׁלְּמַעְלָה, "the eye that is above," Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 91[b]; "there is no release of the ban from above" (מִלְּמַעְלָה), Tanna El. Rabb. 29; "if thou orderest well thy prayer, disfavour shall not be thy portion from on high (צָרֵי עַיִן מִלְּמַעְלָה), j. Taan. 66[d]. See also under Nos. 5, 6, and 10.

9. HOSANNA IN THE HIGHEST.

In the mouth of the multitude we find the cry *ὡσαννά*, Matt. 21[9] (Mark 11[9f.]) On this occasion Matthew and Mark have it twice, and the second time they couple with it *ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*. At the first occurrence here and also in 20[15] Matthew adds *τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ*.

Guillemard[4] finds this Dative surprising, since both הוֹשִׁיעָה

[1] *Baer*, Seder Abodath Yisrael, 153.

[2] Ibid. 229.

[3] What is alluded to is a consort whom a man has acquired through Levirate liabilities, not by his own choice.

[4] *W. H. Guillemard*, Hebraisms in the Greek Testament (1879), i. 44.

and *σῶσον* are transitive, and would require the Accusative. His statement does not quite hold of הוֹשִׁיעַ, which may also be followed by לְ, Ps. 72^{4} 116^{6}; but it cannot, after all, be supposed that a Greek author, to whose mind *σῶσον* occurred as the meaning of *ὡσαννά*, would have followed it up with the Dative.[1] *ὡσαννά* cannot therefore be taken, as by Holtzmann, in the sense: "give greeting to." Inasmuch as the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 10^{6}, substitutes *ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαβίδ*, it cannot be doubted that *ὡσαννά* was understood to be a cry of homage in the sense of "glory" or "hail to the Son of David." This sense will further hold of Matthew's Gospel also, *whose author consequently can have been no Hebraist, and cannot have been the apostle.*[2] And again the connection of *ὡσαννά* with *ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* in Matthew and Mark creates surprise. As regards Matthew, it follows from what has just been said that *ὡσαννά* will here also signify "glory" or "praise." The evangelist takes *ὡ. ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* to mean the same thing as Ps. 148^{1} LXX *αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν (τὸν κύριον) ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*, Hebr. הַלְלוּהוּ בַּמְּרוֹמִים, that is, the song of adoration which the angels are to sing to God. This is the sense attributed to it by Luke also, who, in 19^{38}, has: *ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις*. He too, therefore, did not understand Hebrew. The way in which Mark apprehended the utterance may remain open to question. One might conceivably hold that *ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* had been a substitute for the name of God, which, from the tenor of Ps. 118^{25}, ought properly to have been expressed here. But deliverance ought, of course, to have come "from the highest," and not be given "to the highest." In the former sense only could parallel Jewish expressions be found.[3] And hence the source of the addition *ἐν ὑψίστοις* in Mark also is presumably the mistaken view of *ὡσαννά* to be found in the early Church.

[1] Cf. Ps. 20^{10} הוֹשִׁיעָה הַמֶּלֶךְ, LXX *σῶσον τὸν βασιλέα σου.*

[2] Of course a collection of the sayings of our Lord forming the basis of the "Matthew" Gospel may nevertheless originate from the apostle.

[3] Cf. p. 220.

It must also be said that, in the mouth of those who accompanied Jesus in His entry into the city of Jerusalem, הוֹשַׁע נָא בַּמְּרוֹמִים is but little probable, inasmuch as Ps. 118 did not directly furnish this expression. The mere הוֹשַׁע נָא בָּרוּךְ הַבָּא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, as Mark 11[9] records it, in the first instance will have been the real cry of the multitude. All else in Mark and Matthew is explanatory amplification. In that case the cry requires discussion here only in so far as the divine name has been dropped after הוֹשַׁע נָא. How the יהוה, which comes at the end, was expressed, we do not know. הַשֵּׁם being impossible, שָׁמַיִם might preferably be proposed. But probably, in this case, there would be less hesitation in using the אדני of public worship, since the state of feeling which prompts the exclamation is quite devotional in character. The shout of homage rendered to a king would have to be expressed by Hebr. יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ, as in 1 Kings 1[39], for הוֹשַׁע הַמֶּלֶךְ, 2 Sam. 14[4], is not homage, as Nowack[1] supposes, but an entreaty for help. Thus, too, it becomes clear why the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem was not made a ground of accusation against him before Pilate. Wellhausen[2] rightly supposes that the procession on Palm Sunday did not acquire its pronounced Messianic colouring till a later period. The Teacher and Miracle-worker from Nazareth was then welcomed with jubilation, and accompanied with invocation of blessings. Of the entry of the King, as depicted in Zech. 9[9], few will have thought, and this thought will have occurred to them probably at a later date, rather than on the day itself.

There is no occasion whatever for reverting to the Aram. אוֹשַׁעְנָא, "help us," as the prototype of *ὡσαννά*, because, indeed, the shorter form, הוֹשַׁע, must itself be reckoned the regular form, even in Hebrew, see Jer 31[6], Ps. 86[2]. Moreover, the abbreviated form, הוֹשַׁע נָא, can be verified in Jewish liturgies. The earliest witness for it is the name given to

[1] *W. Nowack*, Hebräische Archäologie, i. 307.
[2] Israelit. u. jüd. Geschichte,[3] 381, note 2.

the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles, יוֹמָא דְּהוֹשַׁעְנָא, Vay. R. 37, and the designation of the branches used for that festival by הוֹשַׁעְנָא, Sukk. 30ᵇ. From a later time come the processional songs with the refrain נָא הוֹשִׁיעָ, see Seder Rab Amram, i. 51ᵇ; Machzor Vitry, 447–456.

10. FROM ON HIGH.

In Luke 24[49] the reception of the Spirit by the disciples is referred to as an endowment with "power from on high" (*ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν*). Acts 1[8] says: *λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*. Both are an echo of Isa. 32[15] עַד יֵעָרֶה עָלֵינוּ רוּחַ מִמָּרוֹם, LXX *ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ*; cf. Wisd. 9[17] *ἔπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων*. The phrase *ἐνδύεσθαι δύναμιν* originates in Old Testament passages like Ps. 92[1] LXX: *ἐνεδύσατο κύριος δύναμιν*. For *ἐξ ὕψους*, see Lam. 1[13] LXX. *ὕψος* is there an equivalent for "heaven": "from on high" is the same as "from God." In Old Testament expressions of this kind an intentional evasion of the name of God cannot be imputed. Probably, however, the use of these terms in Luke springs from this motive.

Similarly, Onkelos does not venture to translate כֹּחַ אֲדֹנָי, "the power of God," Num. 14[17], literally, but replaces it by חֵילָא קֳדָמָךְ יְיָ, "the power in Thy presence, Jhvh." The spirit of Jhvh, which is to rest upon the Messiah, Isa. 11[2], is in the words of the Targum "a spirit of prophecy from before Jhvh" (רוּחַ נְבוּאָה מִן קֳדָם יְיָ), cf. Targ. Isa. 61[1]. The "Spirit of God" in Gen. 1[2] is for Onkelos רוּחָא מִן קֳדָם יְיָ (cf. Targ. Isa. 40[7]), and for Targ. Jerus. I. רוּחַ רַחֲמִין מִן קֳדָם יְיָ, "a spirit of mercy from before God."

Further, in *ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους* [the dayspring from on high], Luke 1[78], *ἐξ ὕψους* represents "from God." Delitzsch renders literally מִמָּרוֹם נִנַּהּ; Resch, copying but not improving upon Delitzsch, הַנִּנַּהּ מִמָּרוֹם. But the association with *ἐπεσκέψατο*

(Hebr. פֶּקַד), which mixes the metaphor based on the light, would be admissible in Hebrew only if נֹגַהּ מִמָּרוֹם were a title coined to denote a definite person. Salkinson has perceived this, and therefore speaks only of "the rise of the dayspring from on high." Still, daylight does not arise from on high. As Bleek has already remarked, the evangelist starts from the assumption that *ἀνατολή*, in accordance with LXX Jer. 23^5, Zech. 3^8 6^{12}, is a name for the Messiah. The version of the LXX obviously comes very near to identifying the Messianic advent with the appearance of light, when they render יְהוָה צֶמַח יְהוָה, Isa. 4^2, by *ἐπιλάμψει ὁ θεός*.

For Luke, therefore, *ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους* is simply "God's Messiah," מְשִׁיחָא דַיְיָ, with which the Targum renders צֶמַח יְהוָה, Isa. 4^3. As the Hebrew צֶמַח excludes the allusion to the light, which follows in v.[79], it is clear that in Luke, chap. 1, an original in Greek lies before us.

11. USE OF THE PASSIVE VOICE.

Sometimes the passive voice of the verb is preferred, on the ground that, if an active voice were used, it would be necessary to name God as the subject. Thus we have: *παρακληθήσονται*, Matt. 5^5; *ἐλεηθήσονται*, 5^7; *κληθήσονται*, 5^9; *κριθῆτε*, 7^1 (Luke 6^{37}); 7^2 *κριτήσεσθε*, *μετρηθήσεται* (Mark 4^{24}, Luke 6^{38} *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται*); *δοθήσεται*, 7^7 (Luke 11^9 6^{38}); $7^{7.8}$ *ἀνοιγήσεται* (Luke $11^{9f.}$ *ἀνοιχθήσεται*); $12^{31f.}$ (Luke 12^{10}) *ἀφεθήσεται*; 21^{43} (cf. Mark 4^{25}, Luke 8^{18}) *ἀρθήσεται*, *δοθήσεται*; Luke 14^{14} *ἀνταποδοθήσεται*; Matt. 23^{12} (Luke 14^{11} 18^{14}) *ταπεινωθήσεται*, *ὑψωθήσεται*; see also Mark 4^{24}, Luke 6^{37}.

In these cases, then, the passive, as a rule, is retraceable to an active whose subject is not specified, as happens in Luke 6^{38} (*δώσουσιν*). In the same way in the translation of Dan. $4^{28f.}$ Kautzsch has rendered the active clauses: לָךְ אָמְרִין מִן אֱנָשָׁא לָךְ טָרְדִין, and עִשְׂבָּא לָךְ יְטַעֲמוּן, in which the subject

would have been God, by the use of the passive: "it is made known to thee"; "from among men thou shalt be cast forth"; "herbage will be given thee for food." The LXX also has here at least *σοὶ λέγεται*, whereas Theodotion renders word for word throughout.

Some instances of this construction from rabbinic literature may be given: כָּל הַמְרַחֵם עַל הַבְּרִיּוֹת מְרַחֲמִין עָלָיו מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, "whosoever pities men, for him there is compassion from heaven,"[1] b. Sabb. 151[b] (Gamaliel III. *c.* 220). כָּל הַמַּעֲבִיר עַל מִדּוֹתָיו מַעֲבִירִין לוֹ עַל כָּל פְּשָׁעָיו, "whosoever is forbearing, for him they overlook all his offences," b. R. h. S. 17[a]; b. Yoma 23[a] (Raba, *c.* 340). הַדָּן אֶת חֲבֵרוֹ לְכַף זְכוּת דָּנִין אוֹתוֹ לְזָכוּת, "he who judges his neighbour charitably, is judged charitably," b. Sabb. 127[b] (Baraitha). כָּל הַמְחַלֵּל שֵׁם שָׁמַיִם בַּסֵּתֶר נִפְרָעִין מִמֶּנּוּ בַּגָּלוּי, "whosover secretly profanes the name of God, him do men punish openly," Ab. iv. 4 (Yokhanan ben Baroka, *c.* 130). בָּא לְטַמֵּא פּוֹתְחִין לוֹ בָּא לְטַהֵר מְסַיְּעִים אוֹתוֹ, "if one goes to contaminate himself, a way is open to him; if one goes to cleanse himself, he is helped," b. Sabb. 104[a] (Simeon ben Lakish, *c.* 260). בְּמִדָּה שֶׁאָדָם מוֹדֵד בָּהּ מוֹדְדִין לוֹ, "with the measure wherewith one measures, therewith is it measured in return," Sota i. 7 (anonym.). הַלָּמֵד עַל מְנָת לְלַמֵּד מַסְפִּיקִין בְּיָדוֹ לִלְמוֹד וּלְלַמֵּד, "he who learns in order to teach, to him is given the power to learn and to teach," Ab. iv. 5 (Ishmael ben Yokhanan, *c.* 160). A passive construction is found in Akiba's saying: חֲבִיבִין יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁנִּקְרְאוּ בָנִים לַמָּקוֹם, "highly favoured are the Israelites because they are called the sons of God."

Part of such sentences, as with those of Jesus, may depend on popular ways of speaking, which originally referred solely to relations between man and his fellows, *e.g.* Hillel's dictum [on seeing a skull floating in the water]: עַל דַּאֲטֵפְתְּ אֲטָפוּךְ, "because thou didst immerse others, men have immersed thee," Ab. ii. 6; and Akiba's admonition: עֲבֵד דְּיַעֲבְדֵךְ סְפוֹד דְּיִסְפְּדֵךְ

[1] Cf. Tos. Shebu. iii. 1: אֵין מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם מוֹחֲלִין לָהֶן, "one forgives them not from heaven."

קְבוֹר דְּיִקְבְּרוּן לָךְ דְּיִלְּלוּן, "do thou, that others may do; weep, that they may weep; bury others, that men may bury thee; accompany others, that they may accompany thee!" j. Keth. 31[b]; [1] or the statement of Bannaa (*c.* 200): אִם יַרְתִּיק יִפְתְּחוּ לוֹ, "if one knocks, they shall open to him." [2] But this explanation does not apply generally, and we cannot avoid the conclusion that hesitation to use the divine name has had an influence on the style. Through a similar tendency in Egypt, in order not to have to express the title, far less the name of the king, there was a predilection for phrases like "one has ordered," "one is now residing (at Thebes)," for "the king has ordered, the king is now residing." [3]

12. AMEN.

It has already been frequently pointed out that the mode in which Jesus uses *ἀμήν* is unfamiliar to the entire range of Jewish literature. Even Sota ii. 5, cf. Jerus. I and II, Numb. 5^{22}, cannot really be forced into comparison. In that passage the repeated Amen pronounced by the woman suspected of adultery is explained as a protestation of her innocence, as if she were to say: "Amen [= I protest] that I have not polluted myself! Amen that I will not pollute myself!" But a literary explanation of this sort must not be made an index to the real colloquial usage. In the latter, אָמֵן never is a corroboration of one's own word, but always of the word, prayer, blessing, oath, or imprecation of some other person. A dictum ascribed to various Palestinian Amoraim says: [4] "Amen is confirmation, Amen is protestation, Amen is assent." From the accompanying comments it may be seen that what is meant is confirmation of the word of

[1] Cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. i. 331.

[2] Vay. R. 21; cf. *Bacher*, ibid. ii. 540 f.

[3] See *A. Erman*, Ägypten, 92, Eng. trans. 58.

[4] j. Sot. 18[b]; b. Shebu. 36[a]; Midr. Ps. 89[4]; cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. pal. Am. i. 112 f.

another, affirmation to the oath prescribed by another, submission of oneself to the declaration of another. He who says "Amen" thereby asserts that the statement of the other is binding also for the speaker. On the other hand, אָמֵן is not an assertion of assured conviction that what has been said by the other will be accomplished,[1] not even in the instance Tob. 8[8], where Sarah, by pronouncing "Amen," takes for her own the prayer of her husband, which, indeed, had been made in her name as well as his.

If Amen be thus synonymous with a corroborative "yes," it becomes clear how *ναί* and *ἀμήν* are treated as identical 2 Cor. 1[20], and are coupled together Rev. 1[7]; and how, even in the words of Jesus, *ναί* appears several times in passages where *ἀμήν* might have been expected, as Matt. 11[9] (Luke 7[26]), Luke 11[51] (Matt. 23[36] *ἀμήν*), Luke 12[5]. *ἀμήν* is replaced by *ἀληθῶς*, Luke 9[27] (Matt. 16[28], Mark 9[1] *ἀμήν*), Luke 12[44] (Matt. 24[47] *ἀμήν*), Luke 21[3] (Mark 12[43] *ἀμήν*); by *ἐπ' ἀληθείας*, Luke 4[25], cf. v.[24]; and by *πλήν*, Luke 22[21] (Matt. 26[21], Mark 14[18] *ἀμήν*). Luke is here the one who uses *ἀμήν* most sparingly, namely, 6 times; whereas in Matthew it appears 30 times, and in Mark 13 times. Just as in the phrases "sovereignty of heaven," "Father in heaven," so here also Luke has avoided as much as possible what would be unfamiliar to his readers.

The double *ἀμήν*, occurring 25 times in John, cannot be used as evidence of the terms used by Jesus. Nor can it be accounted for, as by Delitzsch,[2] through the אֲמִינָא, "I say," of the Babylonians,—a term quite unfamiliar in Pales-

[1] Otherwise represented in *Cremer*, Bibl. theol. Wörterbuch,[8] 141, who further makes the mistake that Amen as an ending for prayers in the synagogue is unusual. But the following prayers all end with Amen: קְדִישׁ (Seder Rab Amram, i. 13[b]), יְהִי רָצוֹן (ibid. 24[a], 33[a]), מִי שֶׁעָשָׂה (33[b]), יְהִי לְרָצוֹן (48[a]), תִּשְׁתַּלַּח אֲסוּתָא (52[b]), תַּעֲנִי (ii. 21[b]), יְקוּם פֻּרְקָן (Machzor Vitry, 172), מִי שֶׁבֵּרַךְ (ibid. 173), besides the priestly benediction, on which see b. Ber. 55[b].

[2] First expressed by *F. Delitzsch*, Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol. 1856, 422 ff., and often repeated since in opposition to the theory of Delitzsch, that Jesus spoke Hebrew.

tine.[1] It is evident, however, from the Johannine usage that *ἀμήν* introducing a statement was regarded as an interjection, and as such it is capable of repetition. Other instances of repetition may be compared: אָמֵן אָמֵן, Num. 5^{22}, Neh. 8^{6}; *ναὶ ναί*, Matt. 5^{37}; *κύριε κύριε*, Luke 6^{46}; *Μάρθα Μάρθα*, Luke 10^{41}; *Σίμων Σίμων*, Luke 22^{31}; *ῥαββὶ ῥαββί*, Matt. 23^{7} D; כַּרְמָא כַּרְמָא, "Vineyard!" Koh. R. v. 14; סָבָא סָבָא, "old man!" j. Sabb. 11^{a}; בַּר יִדַי בַּר יִדַי, "son of a Jew!" j. Ber. 5^{a}; גָּלִיל גָּלִיל, "Galilee!" j. Sabb. 15^{b}; רַבִּי רַבִּי, "teacher!" b. Makk. 24^{a}.

With Jesus, then, there is this peculiarity, that the Hebr. אָמֵן, which in His time was usual only in response to benedictions or oaths, was employed by Him in the Aramaic language as a corroboration of any statement[2] of His prefaced by this word; and this despite the fact that other terms, *e.g.* בְּקוֹשְׁטָא[3] or מִן קוֹשְׁטָא, "verily," were available for the same purpose. This seemed so strange, that Matthew and Mark, as a rule, left the foreign word untranslated. The strangeness of the expression is not felt by Germans, merely because Luther's inexact rendering by "wahrlich" (verily) has effaced its peculiarity.

Clearly an enforcement of what He said by a mere appeal to its truthfulness was not felt to be sufficient by Jesus. With that end in view, no other resource remained open for Him than an averment with the use of an oath, after the manner, say, in which Yokhanan ben Zakkai (*c.* 80 A.D.) confirmed a principle of his teaching before his pupils with חַיֵּיכֶם, "by your life."[4] But an oath had been

[1] To one approaching this question from a study of the Babylonian Talmud, this solution seems very natural; but to one proceeding from the Palestinian literature, such an idea would never have suggested itself. See Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 193.

[2] *H. W. Hogg*, "Amen," Notes on the significance, etc., Jew. Quart. Rev. ix. (1896) 1–23, unsuccessfully tries to prove that in the use of *ἀμήν* by Jesus there is always a retrospect to what has preceded with a view to its confirmation.

[3] See Onk. Gen. 42^{21} בְּקוֹשְׁטָא for the Hebr. אֲבָל.

[4] Pes. d. Rab Kah. 40^{b}; cf. for this specially popular mode of protestation, Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 193.

pronounced by Jesus, Matt. 5^{37}, as displeasing to God; He had therefore to seek for some other mode of emphasis, and found it in the solemn "Amen." This is not an oath, yet more potent than a simple "verily," because it gives the hearer to understand that Jesus confirms His own statement in the same way as if it were an oath or a blessing. Thus did He fulfil His own injunction to make the simple "yea, yea" take the place of an oath. But as Jesus, in forbidding the oath, had in view the guarding against a misuse of the divine name,[1] so here, too, one may speak of a conscious avoidance of the name of God.

The nearest cognate construction in Jewish literature appears in the Babylonian הֵימָנוּתָא, "in truth." Juda ben Ilai (*c.* 150), b. Ned. 49^{b}, says to a woman: "Truth into the hand of this woman (הֵימָנוּתָא בִידָא דְהָהִיא אִיתְתָא), if I shall have any enjoyment!" Instead of this, the same story in j. Sabb. 11^{a} has the Palestinian imprecation: "May the spirit of this woman breathe its last (תִּפַּח רוּחָהּ דְהָהִיא אִיתְתָא)!" Of this הֵימָנוּתָא we are told, b. Sabb. 10^{b}, that it is permissible to utter it in a place which is not ceremonially clean, because the term does not contain the name of God. It is also used as a protestation by Iddi, b. Sanh. 38^{b}, where, however, the הימנותא בידן of the Venice ed. 1520 is represented in the Munich MS. by הֵימָנוּתָא בִידָךְ, "(my) truth into thy hand!"

13. THE DWELLING (SHECHINAH), THE GLORY, THE WORD.

In the Synoptic Gospels we find no representatives of these expressions used in the Targum of Onkelos: שְׁכִינְתָא דַיְיָ, "the dwelling of Jhvh"; יְקָרָא דַיְיָ, "the glory of Jhvh"; מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ, "the word of Jhvh" (as to which it may be remarked that מֵימַר is different from פִּתְגָם, the latter being the word in Onkelos for the Hebr. דָּבָר). Besides these, more

[1] For the Jewish view of the commandment of Ex. 20^{7} see my treatise, Der Gottesname Adonaj, 51 f., 60 ff., 66 ff.

recent Targums offer דִּבּוּרָא דַיְיָ [1] (דִּבּוּרָא), "the word of Jhvh," which is properly the Aramaicised *Hebrew* equivalent of מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ, and found its way into these Targums from rabbinic Hebrew. All these ideas which do not denote concrete hypostases of the Deity, but abstractions, originally served the single purpose of guarding, during the reading of Scripture in the synagogues, against sensible representations of God, such as the Bible text might have aroused among the common people. They were products of the reflection of the scribes, and we do not know in regard to them whether they really were general characteristics of the style of Targum exposition in the Palestinian synagogues, having nothing directly to do with the philosophic speculation of Philo, apart from the common motive which inspired both movements. Apart from the biblical text, which they were intended to preserve from misconception, there was no great occasion for their use. Besides, the spoken language was rich in cautious circumlocutions for God. It is thus quite natural that in ordinary life their use should be comparatively limited. But in use they actually were, subject only to the usual evasion of the divine name outside of public worship; and, as a rule, the form used was Hebrew: הַדִּבּוּר, הַכָּבוֹד, הַשְּׁכִינָה (הַדִּבּוּר).[2] Aramaic examples, apart from the Targums, are rare; still see מֵימְרָא דִשְׁמַיָּא, "the word of heaven," in the prayer beginning תִּשְׁתַּבַּח אָסוּתָא, Seder Rab Amram, i. 52[b]; cf. Targ. Eccl.

[1] דִּבֵּר occurs Jer. 5[15] in the biblical text, and *Giesebrecht* (Comm.) finds the reason for the punctuation there unintelligible. Though neither Gesenius-Buhl nor Siegfried-Stade adduce it as a noun in the Lexicons, it is a word certainly verifiable in Jewish diction, from which Levy curiously has made דִּבִּיר. See, *e.g.*, Hebr. הדיבר, Vay. R. 1, ed. Constant. 1512; j. Sabb. 10[c], ed. Venice, 1524; Aram. דִּי בֵּירָא, Targ. Ez. 1[24. 25], ed. Venice, 1517, 1525 (ed. Buxtorf דִּיבּוּרָא); דִּיבֵּירָא, Targ. Cant. 1[11], MS. Lond. Or. 2375; דיבירא, j. Taan. 65[d]. *Ginsburger*, Die Anthropomorphismen in den Targumim (1896), 9, is surprised that in the Paris MS. of the Fragmentary Targum he should find דברא. It is, however, just the ancient דִּבְּרָא, subsequently extruded as a rule by דִּבּוּרָא.

[2] *Holtzmann's* statements, Lehrb. d. neut. Theol. i. 57 f., on these topics are quite erroneous. In contrast to the Memar,—the special intermediary proper,—Shechinah, according to H., is an impersonal representation of God, which, in the Talmud, has taken the place of the Memar.

4^4 11^3; and מֵימְרָא דִלְעֵיל, "the word that is above," Jerus. I Lev. 24^{12}. Here too, of course, one is far removed from the idea of divine hypostases. The name used is הַדִּבּוּר and מֵימְרָא, but the reality meant is "God." Jesus may have been acquainted with these Targumic terms; but no necessity for using them presented itself.

In the New Testament we have suggestions of the phrase of the Targums: יְקָרָא דַיְיָ, "the glory of God," in Rom. 9^4, where *ἡ δόξα* is reckoned among the prerogatives peculiar to Israel, Heb. 1^3 *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, 9^5 *χερουβεῖν δόξης*, John 12^{41}, where it is said of Isaiah: *εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (*Χριστοῦ*), while the Targum reproduces Isa. 6^5 by "mine eyes saw the glory of the dwelling (Shechinah) of the King of the ages (יְקָר שְׁכִינַת מַלְכָּא עָלְמַיָּא), Jhvh Sebaoth"; and in 2 Pet. 1^{17}, according to which the voice at the Transfiguration of Jesus proceeded *ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης*. In the last-named passage, however, it should be remarked that a Targum would preferably have named the Memar of God. מֵימַר, as well as יְקָר and שְׁכִינָה, appear to be represented in John 1^{14} *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*. *ὁ λόγος* is מֵימְרָא; *ἐσκήνωσεν* represents שְׁכִינְתָא; *δόξα* stands for יְקָרָא. All the three entities became incarnate in Jesus; and in this, at least, a use is made of these ideas which is at variance with their primary application.

14. THE PLACE.

Wholly absent from the New Testament is the Jewish designation of God as הַמָּקוֹם, "the Place." This term G. Buchanan Gray[1] mistakenly tries to find as early as Sirach 41^{19}, Ryle and James[2] as early as Ps. Sol. 16^9. According to the Mishna Taan. iii. 8, Simeon ben Shetakh (*c.* 80 B.C.)

[1] Jew. Quart. Rev. ix. 567 ff.
[2] In their edition of the Psalter of Solomon.

had already used it, but its evidence in reference to the linguistic form of sayings from so remote a period is of little value. It is certain only that in the Mishna, by 200 A.D., the designation of God by הַמָּקוֹם is quite current. It is the most colourless appellation for God which the Mishna contains.

In הַמָּקוֹם it appears that men were not content to name instead of God, His dwelling-place heaven; but as this itself had become a divine name, they desired when possible only to allude obscurely to it, so that only the place (*i.e.* of God) was mentioned, when the intention was to name "Heaven," meaning "God." In the choice of the term the efficient cause was not the philosophic idea that God is the locus of the world,—though this had been expressed as early as by Ammi (*c.* 280 A.D.),[1]—but the language used in the Old Testament where the "place" of God is frequently spoken of while heaven is meant;[2] see Hos. 5^{15} מְקוֹמִי, "My place"; Targ. מְדוֹר קֻדְשִׁי דִּבְשְׁמַיָּא, "My holy dwelling in heaven"; Isa. 26^{21} מְקוֹמוֹ, "His place"; Targ. אֲתַר שְׁכִינְתֵּיהּ, "the place of His dwelling." The casual expression, מְקוֹם שֵׁם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, "the place of the name of Jhvh of hosts," by which the temple was originally meant, may also have played its part in creating the usage. In itself מְקוֹם יְיָ ought to mean "the place of God"; but just as הַשְּׁכִינָה, "the dwelling-place," הַדִּבּוּר, "the Word," were said in place of יְיָ שְׁכִינַת, דִּבּוּר יְיָ, so here also the name of God is omitted and replaced by the article. הַמָּקוֹם is "*the* place" *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, that is, of God.

No Aramaic equivalent for הַמָּקוֹם ever presents itself. The term thus belonged entirely to the Hebrew language of the legal schools, and never became popular. This being so, it is not to be expected that it should be used by Jesus, even supposing it should have already been used in the legal schools of His time.

[1] Ber. R. 68; cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. pal. Am. ii. 163 f.

[2] Already maintained by *A. Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. ii. 228. *Landau*, Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott. 41 ff., errs in supposing Parsee influences as contributory.

15. CONCLUDING STATEMENT.

Religious custom among the Jews, in respect to the use and avoidance of the name of God, has been found, according to what has been said under VI.–VIII., to constitute the standard followed by Jesus; but, of course, in such a manner that, in conforming to it, He preserved a peculiar position of His own by His marked preference for the appellation of God as Father.

It would certainly be a mistake to regard all the other evasive locutions for God which have the sanction of Jesus as mere accommodation on His part to prevalent custom. Superstitious ideas, foreign to the true Revealed Religion, in regard to the character of the divine name, may have contributed to the formation of the current custom. When it was supposed that the enunciation of God's name would bring down into this world the divine Person magically associated[1] with that name, there were strong objections against taking it upon one's lips. But the decisive element in the circumstances was, of course, the commandment of the Decalogue (Ex. 20^{7}): "Thou shalt not needlessly pronounce the name of Jhvh thy God";[2] and beneath that there lay a genuine religious reverence, inspired by the thought of the Judge of the worlds, enthroned in heaven. This reverence Jesus did not choose to set aside, Matt. 10^{28} (Luke 12^{5}); He even intensified it. The Heavenly Father, whom He declared, remained always the Omnipotent Lord. The archaic position of authority ascribed in the family to the father, who, above all things has an unlimited paternal control, was firmly maintained. There is nothing in the teaching of Jesus to favour the idea of a mystical absorption in the Deity, such as obliterates the distinctions between Creator and creature.

[1] See on this point *F. C. Conybeare*, Jew. Quart. Rev. ix. 581 ff.

[2] On the Jewish interpretation of this commandment see my treatise, "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 51 f., 60 ff., 66 ff.

Still, matters must not be represented as if the deeper insight gained by Israel after the exile in Babylon into the transcendent majesty of God, were nothing but a relapse in comparison with the knowledge of God in the older prophecy, so that Jesus was under the necessity of reverting to the earlier prophetic standpoint. Directly opposed to such a view is the peculiar significance attached by Jesus to the Book of Daniel as well as to the writing of the second Isaiah, although Daniel obviously bears the impress of a new epoch in the process of Revelation, widely separated from the earlier prophecy.[1]

IX. THE SON OF MAN.

1. THE LINGUISTIC FORM OF THE EXPRESSION.

To understand the designation which Jesus chose to apply to Himself: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, it is important to observe the way in which the corresponding terms in Hebr. בֶּן אָדָם, and Aramaic בַּר אֱנָשׁ are used.

In *biblical Hebrew*, אָדָם (as also אֱנוֹשׁ) is nearly always used as a collective expression, and can therefore stand beside the collectives בְּהֵמָה, "quadrupeds," and בָּקָר, "cattle,"[2] often having to be rendered in German by the plural "men." If it be necessary to specify a plurality of individual men, Hebrew can only say בְּנֵי אָדָם or בְּנֵי הָאָדָם, for which see Gen. 11^5, Deut. 32^8 (with גּוֹיִם), 2 Sam. 7^{14} (with אֲנָשִׁים), Mic. 5^6, Isa. 52^{14} (with אִישׁ). In later times, from the evidence of the Psalms and of Ecclesiastes,[3] this appears to have become a common term for "mankind," not belonging exclusively to poetry. For the single human being, it is generally אִישׁ or אִשָּׁה that is used.

[1] The writings of the pre-exilic prophets are, on the other hand, of slight importance for Jesus.

[2] See Ex. 9^{19}, Num. $31^{28.47}$.

[3] See also Dan. 10^{16}, Sir. 40^1.

On the other hand, the singular form בֶּן אָדָם, apart from its frequent use as a nominative of address in Ezekiel,[1] was always rare.[2] It is found only in poetic language where parallelism supplies a motive for its use, see Num. 23^{19} (with אִישׁ); Isa. 51^{12} (with אֱנוֹשׁ), 56^{2} the same; Jer. $49^{18.\,33}$ 50^{40} 51^{43} (all with אִישׁ); Ps. 8^{5} (with אֱנוֹשׁ), 80^{18} (with אִישׁ), 146^{3} (with נְדִיבִים); Job 16^{21} (with גֶּבֶר), 25^{6} (with אֱנוֹשׁ), 35^{8} (with אִישׁ); cf. בֶּן אֱנוֹשׁ, Ps. 144^{3} (with אָדָם). In the Apocrypha בֶּן אָדָם is found only in allusion to Old Testament phrases. In Judith 8^{16} *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* occurs in a statement which depends upon Num. 23^{19}. An echo of the same scriptural passage will be found in Sirach 17^{30}, if *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is there a literal rendering of the original.[3] A similar echo is unmistakable in the solitary instance of *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (Joseph 2).

This generic scope of אָדָם has, as its natural corollary, the fact that בֶּן אָדָם denotes, not "the son of a certain man," but the member of the genus man; cf. אַחַד הָאָדָם, "one of the genus man," *i.e.* "an ordinary man," Judg. 16^{7}.

The *biblical Aramaic* does not differ from the usage in Hebrew. The simple אֱנָשׁ, not בַּר אֱנָשׁ, is the word for "man." In the next place, in Aramaic אֱנָשׁ is also the term for the generic conception "mankind," and can stand where we should say "men." Hence בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא, "the sons of man," is equivalent to the simple אֱנָשָׁא; cf. מִן אֱנָשָׁא טָרִיד, Dan. 4^{30}, with מִן בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא טָרִיד, 5^{21}.[4] Both mean "he was driven out from among mankind." When there comes with the clouds of heaven one כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, Dan. 7^{13}, he is described as resembling one of the human species, or as one who had in himself the nature of a human being; just as in 3^{25} the fourth in the

[1] Daniel also is once named in this way (8^{17}).

[2] It is a defect in *Lietzmann's* researches on "Der Menschensohn" (1896) 30 ff., that he has not investigated separately the use of singular and plural. The representation given of the Old Testament usage in *H. Appel*, Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu: Der Sohn des Menschen (1896), 28–48, is quite erroneous.

[3] The Syriac version is considerably different.

[4] Similarly דְּמוּת בְּנֵי אָדָם, Dan. 10^{16}, and כְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם, 10^{18}, are identical.

fiery furnace is described דְּמֵה לְבַר אֱלָהִין, as one who resembles the gods. In substance, though not in verbal form, a unit of the species is also meant, when in 7^4 it is said of a beast that it was made to stand upon two feet, כֶּאֱנָשׁ, "as a man." An individual man is גְּבַר (2^{25}).

In the *Hebrew of the Mishna*, which, being Aramaic in the guise of Hebrew, affords important testimony for our present purpose, הָאָדָם is "the human being," Ab. ii. 1, 11, iii. 10, 14; אָדָם אֶחָד is "a man," Ab. vi. 9. "Mankind" is not infrequently בְּרִיּוֹת, "creatures," Ab. i. 12, ii. 11, but also בְּנֵי אָדָם. This last expression is used to denote ordinary "men," "the people," Ber. i. 3; Taan. i. 7, and b. Mo. k. 19ᵃ (Simeon ben Yokhai, *c.* 130). In Ned. viii. 5, 6, דֶּרֶךְ בְּנֵי אָדָם means "the common custom"; and לְשׁוֹן בְּנֵי אָדָם is "the common parlance," Siphre, ed. Friedm. 33ᵃ (Ishmael, *c.* 110). The singular בֶּן אָדָם is altogether uncommon.

The *Targum of Onkelos* generally conforms to the Hebrew text. In Gen. 11^5, Deut. 32^8 it has בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא for בְּנֵי (הָ)אָדָם; Gen. 6^1, בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא for the simple הָאָדָם; the same again, Num. 23^{19}, both for אִישׁ and for בֶּן אָדָם, and in Deut. 32^{26} for אֱנוֹשׁ. The singular number בַּר אֱנָשׁ, which is twice used in Targ. Jerus. I Num. 23^{19} appears to be intentionally avoided by Onkelos. Moreover, "a human being" is always אֱנָשׁ, and not בַּר אֱנָשׁ. In this respect Onkelos and the Mishna agree.

In the *Samaritan Pentateuch* אנש is also the word for "a human being." Only in Num. 23^{19}, conformably with the Hebrew, do we find בר אנש. The plural forms appear בני אנשא, Gen. 11^5; ברי אדם, Deut. 32^8. Marka also, where he does not use אדם, has אנש; see *Heidenheim*, Bibl. Sam. iii. 2^b, 59^a, 130^a, 131^b; *Munk*, Des Sam. Marqah Erzählung über d. Tod Mose's, 44, 48. The form ברנשיתה in Munk, p. 48, is unusual, and, of course, should be corrected into ברנשיה.

The *Targum to the Prophets*, which is of minor consequence

for Aramaic usage, has in Mic. 5^6 בַּר אֱנָשׁ, replacing בְּנֵי אָדָם. Elsewhere בַּר אֱנָשׁ is found in agreement with the Hebrew text, Isa. 51^{12} 56^2, Jer. $49^{18.33}$ 50^{40} 51^{43}.[1] When the Targumist uses בַּר אָדָם to represent בֶּן אָדָם in Ezekiel, it is clear that he takes the meaning to be "son of Adam." The plural בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא is often used.—Nor do the Aramaic *Inscriptions* attest a single instance of בַּר אֱנָשׁ for Palestine. The Palmyra customs tariff, of date 137 A.D., puts אנש מדעם for "any person whatever." אנוש appears for "any one" in Nabatæan inscriptions, CIS II. i. 197, 209 f., 212, 214, 220, 223 f.; and in the inscription from Tema, ibid. 113^a, אנש stands for "men."

The *Jewish-Galilean*, along with the *Christian-Palestinian*, are the earliest dialects to contain בַּר אֱנָשׁ in the sense of "a human being," although in both these types of language the simple אֱנָשׁ remains current for "any one": for the former dialect see, *e.g.*, j. Ber. 13^4, j. Sanh. 25^a, Ber. R. 69; for the latter see *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 32. בַּר אֱנָשׁ for "a human being" then made its way also into the Jerusalem Targums on the Pentateuch, Jerus. I Num. 9^{13} 23^{19}. Even the Aramaic recension of the Book of Tobit[2] has twice (8^{18} 12^1) put בַּר נָשׁ for "any one," while elsewhere it uses אֱנָשׁ (3^8 4^{19}), בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא (8^4), plur. const. אֱנָשֵׁי (1^{19} 12^1).

As a result of the general situation here reviewed, it must be concluded that the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the earlier period possessed the term אֱנָשׁ for "a human being"; while, to indicate a number of human beings, it employed occasionally בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא. The singular number בַּר אֱנָשׁ was not in use; its appearance being due to imitation of the Hebrew text, where בֶּן אָדָם is confined to poetry, and, moreover, uncommon in it. The case in Dan. 7^{13}, where the person coming from heaven is described as כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, "one like unto a son of man," is just as uncongenial to the style of prose as the designation of God in the same verse as עַתִּיק יוֹמַיָּא, "the

[1] *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 31, appears to have overlooked this.
[2] See on this point Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 27 ff.

advanced in days," "the aged,"[1] the ordinary prose for "old" being, of course, סָבָא. Further, according to the theory proposed on p. 13, the original of Dan. 7 was Hebrew, in support of which we may refer to the occurrence of עִלָּיוֹן peculiar to this chapter. If this theory be correct, then בַּר אֱנָשׁ in Dan. 7[13], as in other cases, is simply the translation of the Hebr. בֶּן אָדָם.

It is in keeping with the peculiar nature felt to be inherent in בַּר אֱנָשׁ that, like the Hebr. בֶּן אָדָם, it never occurs in the definite form. בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, just like בֶּן הָאָדָם, is quite unheard of in the older Jewish Aramaic literature. "The human being" is there called merely אֱנָשָׁא. If, however, Judæans, Samaritans, and probably also Nabatæans and Palmyrenians, had this expression in use, it may be supposed that in this respect the Galileans in the time of Jesus formed no exception; and that the use of בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, בַּר נָשָׁא in the Jewish-Galilean and Christian-Palestinian literature, which at a later time was probably common to all Aramaic-speaking Palestinians, was an innovation introduced into Palestine from the north-east along with many other influences affecting the use of terms and the vocabulary.[2]

A final testimony for the terms used by Jesus is afforded by His own words as reported in the Gospels. "Man," both in the singular and in the plural, is frequently enough the subject of remark. How is it that *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* never occurs for "man," and *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* only in Mark 3[28]? Can the Hellenistic reporters—apart from the self-appellation of Jesus—have designedly avoided it, although Jesus had on all occasions said nothing but "son of man" for "man"? That cannot be considered likely.

Holtzmann[3] calls it a "discovery" that "son of man"

[1] The rendering "the Ancient of days" is inexact, and would require עַתִּיקָא דְיוֹמָיָא. From עַתִּיק יוֹמִין also, v.[9], it is apparent that the ending does not define יוֹמִין, but the compound expression.

[2] Lietzmann omits all proof that the Galilean, with its use of בַּר אֱנָשׁ, must be valid for the time of Jesus.

[3] Lehrb. d. neutestamentl. Theol. i. 256.

would be the only available term for "man" in the mother-tongue of Jesus. Wellhausen affirms:[1] "the Aramæans have no other term for that conception"; and Lietzmann, agreeing with Eerdmans,[2] on this topic constructs the thesis:[3] "Jesus never applied to Himself the title 'Son of man,' for this term does not exist in Aramaic, and *for linguistic reasons is an impossible term.*"[4] Nevertheless it is a grievous error, which careful observation of the biblical Aramaic alone would have rendered impossible.

When the composite expression בַּר אֱנָשׁ, "son of man," had to be made definite, the determinative could attach only to אֱנָשׁ, as to אָדָם in the Hebr. בֶּן אָדָם. Thus arises בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, בֶּן הָאָדָם, which must not be rendered simply by "the human being" ("der Mensch,"—as by de Lagarde, Wellhausen, Lietzmann), but only by "the son of man," if the essential character of the expression is not to be entirely obliterated.

If, again, "the son of the man" had to be expressed in Aramaic, it would have been necessary to say בְּרֵהּ דְּאֱנָשָׁא (literally, "his son, that of the man"). The Mishna Hebrew would say בְּנוֹ שֶׁלָּאָדָם. It is therefore in no way surprising that the Christian-Palestinian version of the Gospels renders *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* by בְּרֵהּ דְּבַר נָשָׁא, or sometimes, to escape the inconvenient repetition of בַּר, by בְּרֵהּ דְּנַבְרָא. The principle of literal faithfulness in the translation led naturally to the production of this expression, which the same dialect further used for בֶּן אָדָם in Job 16[21], as remarked by Nestle.[5] In a dialect where בַּר נָשָׁא was the common word for "man," this term would be no equivalent for the peculiar expression in question. Certainly בְּרֵהּ דְּבַר נָשָׁא tended to the error, which the German "der Sohn des Menschen" also suggests, that the person so entitled was the *son* of some one. In this sense the

[1] Israelit. und jüdische Geschichte,[3] 381.

[2] Theol. Tijdschr. 1894, 165 ff. [3] Der Menschensohn (1896), 85.

[4] The italics of the last clause are due to me.

[5] See *A. S. Lewis*, A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary (1897), xxxi; cf. p. 56, ברה דבר נשא.

translator will also have understood the Greek *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*.

But the Greek expression is itself merely the outcome of sore embarrassment. *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* can indeed be regarded as the Greek singular for *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, which the LXX has coined for בְּנֵי אָדָם, and which occurs Mark 3^{28} and Eph. 3^{5}. But while the plural substantially corresponds to the Hebr. בְּנֵי אָדָם, the expression "the sons of men" of course signifying men in general, in the singular form an unnatural stress was laid upon both members of the phrase. No assistance could be got from *ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, for this would have meant merely "the son of a man." In Greek, then, *ἄνθρωπος* is neither a generic conception like אֱנוֹשׁ, אָדָם, nor is *υἱός* the term for an individual endowed with the nature implied in the generic term. The readiest substitute for בַּר אֱנָשָׁא would still have been *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* with no addition. But then, what disastrous misunderstandings would have been occasioned by the change in the Gospels of the uncommon expression of the original into an ordinary expression! In view of this, it was therefore preferred to convey the impression, suggested in Aramaic by בַּר אֱנָשׁ when made definite, by the utmost possible definiteness in the composite expression. Thus was avoided at least the error of supposing that "the man" merely as such was meant, and there was acquired the possibility of using this expression as a self-appellation of Jesus. That the Hellenists from the beginning apprehended the term, not in a Semitic, but in a Greek sense, with the feeling that Jesus in some sense had pronounced Himself on the human side of His nature as "descended from men," is all too probable. To this point we refer later.

In these circumstances it can be seen why the Christian Hellenists avoided the term as much as possible, and did not adopt it into their religious phraseology. In Aramaic, indeed, בַּר אֱנָשָׁא was perfectly suitable as the special name of a definite personality; but its reproduction in Greek would be

as defectively inaccurate as it would—though for different reasons—be in Syriac and Christian-Palestinian. In German, "des Menschen Sohn" is a correct rendering of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, but the Aramaic בַּר אֱנָשָׁא is represented with some degree of success only by "der Menschensohn."

2. "SON OF MAN" WAS NOT A CURRENT JEWISH NAME FOR THE MESSIAH.

There is no need to begin by proving here that for the author of the Book of Daniel, "the one resembling a son of man" in chap. 7^{13} is a personification of the "people of the saints of the Most High" (v.[27], cf. v.[22]), who are destined one day to receive an imperishable dominion as an award from God. The vision, in which the one like unto a son of man is seen, is a parallel to Dan. $2^{44f.}$, where the establishment by God of an eternal sovereignty is the explanation of the stone[1] which shatters the great statue without any assistance from man. In contrast with the beasts emerging from the sea, types of preceding secular powers, the one like unto a son of man, type of the future possessor of universal dominion, comes "with the clouds of heaven" (עִם עֲנָנֵי שְׁמַיָּא). The expression is surprising because the judicial session of the "Advanced in days," in which He Himself appears, is held in the place where the animals have their being, *i.e.* upon the earth.[2] Besides, it would be more appropriate if the one like to a son of man were to come "*upon* the clouds of heaven."

[1] This stone is interpreted as referring to the sovereignty of the Messiah, Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Ber. 70[b]; Bemidb. R. 13. 2 Esdras connects with the stone its own peculiar representation of the mountain which "that man" brings with him; see 2 Esdr. $13^{6f.}$ 12^{36}.

[2] No change of scene is suggested in 7^{9}. The divine chariot furnished with wheels and a throne is that described by Ezekiel which was to serve God at His appearance upon earth. There is therefore no occasion for the view brought forward by *Holsten*, Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol. 1891, 62, and by *Appel*, Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu: der Sohn des Menschen, 40 ff., that the scene of the judgment is conceived as being above the earth, and that the one like to a son of man comes thither from the earth.

A reading עַל עֲנָנֵי שְׁמַיָּא [1] appears to be presupposed by *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν*, LXX Dan. 7^{13}; cf. Matt. 24^{30} 26^{64}, Mark 13^{26} D, Rev. 14^{14-16}, Teaching of the Apostles 16^{8} (*ἐπάνω*), Justin, Apol. 1^{51} (*ἐπάνω*), Hegesippus in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii. 23. On the other hand, the reading of the Massoretic text (עִם) is represented in Theodotion, Mark 14^{62}, Rev. 1^{7}, 2 Esdr. 14^{3}. The words *ἐν νεφέλαις*, Mark 13^{26}, *ἐν νεφέλῃ*, Luke 21^{27}, similarly imply accompaniment, and presuppose *μετά* = עִם. It belongs to God only to move upon the clouds; see Isa. 19^{1}, Ps. 104^{3}. In the endeavour to minimise the divine manifestation in the one like to a son of man, a subsequent writer will have changed עַל into עִם. But even if one reads עִם, the fact remains that the destined possessor of the universal dominion comes, not from the earth, far less from the sea, but from heaven. He is a being standing in a near relation to God, well fitted to typify the people of the saints of God. It is noteworthy that nothing more is said of him than that he resembles man. He is distinguished from the four beasts, not because he alone possesses reason; the first beast, according to 7^{4}, receives "a man's heart," the last has "the eyes of a man," and can speak (v.^{8}). The emphasis rather lies on the fact that in contrast with the winged lion, the devouring bear, the four-headed leopard, the fourth beast with ten horns terrible exceedingly beyond its predecessors, he appears unarmed and inoffensive, incapable through any power of his own of making himself master of the world; he is only as a son of man. If ever he is to be master of the world, God must make him so.

From the first Christian century there are only two Jewish writings known which deal with Dan. 7^{13}, the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch, and the Second Book of Esdras. The two agree in regarding the one like to a son of man as an individual person. And as they combine

[1] *E. Nestle*, Marginalien und Materialien, 1893, i. 40, remarked upon the importance of this reading.

Dan. 7 with Messianic prophecies from the Old Testament, they clearly show that they regard this individual as the Messiah. Special attention must be given to the name they use in this connection for Messiah.

The *Similitudes of Enoch* (chaps. 37–71), whose Jewish character need not be doubted,[1] though it cannot be proved that they originate from a pre-Christian period, introduce 46^{1} a being, partaking of the nature of angels and of men, to whom reference is afterwards made as "that son of man," $46^{2.\,4}$ 48^{2} $62^{5.\,9.\,14}$ 63^{11}, while only "the son of man" is said in 46^{3} $62^{7\,2}$ $69^{26.\,27.\,29}$ 70^{1} 71^{17}. N. Schmidt,[3] however, says that little stress can be laid on the use or non-use of the Ethiopic demonstrative, so that throughout *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* may be what is represented. Similarly no importance attaches to the fact that the Ethiopic version vacillates in its choice of a term for "son of man," sometimes even putting "son of a man," "son of a woman."[4] It is clear, at all events, that "son of man" is not taken for granted by the author as an already established title for the Messiah. But it is not to be denied that the author, though in this part of the Similitudes he avoids every other Messianic title, really imputes to "the son of man" a Messianic significance. This is seen most obviously in 46^{3}. The "son of man who has righteousness" is certainly not a periphrasis for "the righteous man," but is meant to recall 38^{2} 39^{6}, where the Messiah bears the name, "the chosen one who is righteous," or "the elect of righteousness." That again, on its part, must be considered an allusion to צֶמַח צַדִּיק, Jer. 23^{5}; צֶמַח

[1] A Christian author or interpolator should above all things have made it clear in some way that the "son of man" coming to the judgment was Jesus of Nazareth. But the "son of man" in this case appears never to have been upon earth, far less to have passed through the state of death.

[2] This passage is highly uncertain.

[3] See his essay, "Was בר נשא a Messianic title?" Journal of Bibl. Lit. xv. (1896) 48.

[4] That these really refer to "son of man," see *R. H. Charles* on Enoch 46^{2}, and *N. Schmidt*, op. cit. 46 ff.

צֶדֶק, Jer. 33[15], for which the Targum has מְשִׁיחַ דִּצְדָקָה, "Messiah of righteousness."[1]

Probably the author of the Similitudes, in using "son of man," did not intend to introduce any new designation for the Messiah. Still it is significant that he consistently applies this name exclusively to the mysterious personality who never was upon earth, and yet is not God. If the original was Hebrew, we should here have בַּר הָאָדָם (with the article) as an exceptional instance in the earlier Jewish literature; and it would also represent a considerable development beyond the stage seen in the Book of Daniel, which uses, 10[16. 18], the terms כִּדְמוּת בְּנֵי אָדָם, כְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם, meaning "the one resembling man," to denote a definite personality.

In an interpolation in the Similitudes it is Enoch himself who is the son of man, brought according to Dan. 7 before the ancient of days. By this name he is addressed 60[10], and in 71[14] the words are used to him: "thou art the son of man who art born for righteousness," in which there is evident at least an allusion to צֶמַח צָדָק, "the righteous Branch."

Turning now to the Second Book of *Esdras*, we find in chap. 13 a different style of language. Here a wind causes to rise up from the sea "as it were the likeness of a man" (Syr. איך דמות דברנשא). He is then referred to in v.[3] as "ille homo" (Syr. הו ברנשא),[2] in v.[5] as "homo, qui ascenderat de mari" (Syr. ברנשא הו דסלק מן ימא), in v.[12] as "ipse homo" (Syr. הו ברנשא), and in vv.[25. 51], cf. v.[33], as "vir ascendens de corde maris" (Syr. גברא דסלק מן לבה דימא). If the original was Hebrew, the Syriac גברא would represent הָאִישׁ; the Syriac ברנשא, Lat. "homo," would, on the other hand, be הָאָדָם, and correspondingly in v.[3] we should have כִּדְמוּת אָדָם, not כִּדְמוּת בַּר אָדָם, cf. Dan. 10[18]. The author's dependence upon Dan. 7 must be admitted, although he represents—doubtless not

[1] Cf. under XI. 1.

[2] The Latin version has "convolabat ille homo cum nubibus," but the beginning is lost.

unintentionally—the figure in human form as rising from the sea. But for בַּר אֱנָשׁ he has put אָדָם, the term proper to prose style, and from that, of course, a Messianic title could not well be formed.

A Messianic interpretation of Dan. 7^{13} appears to have been assumed by Akiba (*c.* 120 A.D.), when he spoke of the "thrones" of Dan. 7^{9} as prepared for God and for David, b. Sanh. 38^{b}. This statement of Akiba then gave rise to the description of the Sepher Hechaloth,[1] which says that David, adorned with a crown in which are embedded the sun, the moon, and the twelve signs of the zodiac, takes his seat in heaven upon a throne which is erected for him in front of the throne of God. Joshua ben Levy (*c.* 250)[2] brought forward the alternative that, if Israel were worthy, then the Messiah would come, as in Dan. 7^{13}, with the clouds of heaven; but if Israel were unworthy, he would come riding upon the ass, as said in Zech. 9^{9}. Samuel ben Nachman (*c.* 270)[3] says that, according to Dan. 7^{13}, the angels accompany the Messiah as far as their precincts allow, while God then conducts him to Himself, according to Jer. 30^{21}. Other late testimonies are referred to in Dalman, "Der leidende und der sterbende Messias," 38 note.[4]

It is a mere suggestion of Dan. 7^{13} that appears in Targ. Jerus. II on Ex. 12^{42}, which says that the Messiah will lead His people like Moses, בְּרֵישׁ עֲנָנָא, "on the summit of the cloud." The cloud is there conceived as accompanying the Messiah during His activity. On account of the "cloud" (עֲנָן) in Dan. 7^{13}, it is said that the person named עֲנָנִי, who is the last in the Davidic line in 1 Chron. 3^{24}, will be the Messiah, Midr. Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Ber. 70^{b}, and in the Targum on the passage. Probably we should also mention here the Messianic name בר נפלי, though it is otherwise

[1] Seder Rab Amram, i. 13^{a}; *Jellinek*, Beth ha-Midrasch, v. 168, cf. vi. 150 f.
[2] b. Sanh. 98^{a}; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. i. 152.
[3] Midr. Psalms, 21^{7}, cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. i. 548.
[4] The citation of Dan. 7^{13} in the Midrash on Ps. 2^{7} is probably spurious.

explained by the Babylonian Nachman b. Sanh. 96b, provided נפלי stands for *νεφέλη*, which is very doubtful.[1]

Along with these indications of a Messianic interpretation of Dan. 7[13], we find traces of a different exposition of the passage in the anonymous saying, Midr. Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Vay. 36b:[2] "What mean the 'thrones' (Dan. 7[9])? One day God will be seated, and the angels will give thrones to the great ones of Israel that they too may sit, while God sits among them as president of the court of justice, and thus they judge the peoples of the world"; cf. Matt. 19[28] (Luke 22[30]).

Again we have a divergence from Dan. 7[13] in the statement of the Palestinian Amora, Abbahu,[3] who lived in Cæsarea about 280 A.D. Intending to controvert the divinity of Christ, he asserted, j. Taan. 65b, basing his words on Num. 23[19]:[4] אִם יֹאמַר לְךָ אָדָם אֵל אֲנִי מְכַזֵּב הוּא בֶּן אָדָם אֲנִי סוֹפוֹ לִתְהוֹת בּוֹ שֶׁאֲנִי עוֹלֶה לַשָּׁמַיִם הַהוּא אָמַר וְלֹא יְקִימֶנָּה, "if any one say to thee, 'I am God,' he speaks falsely; 'I am the son of man,' his end is to regret it; 'I ascend to heaven'—he who has said so will not verify his word." Only thus can the passage be translated.[5] בֶּן אָדָם is here equivalent to אֵל. It has no article, because Num. 23[19] has none. The "ascending into heaven" depends, as it seems, upon Isa. 14[13f.], where the

[1] On both names see "Der leidende und der sterbende Messias," 37 f.

[2] Cf. Shem. R. 5, the similar saying of Abin.

[3] As to Abbahu, see *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. ii. 88–142.

[4] Allusion is made to this passage in a late addition to a saying of Eleazar ha-Kappar, Yalk. Shim. (ed. Salonica, 1526) on Num. 23[7]; see *Dalman-Laible-Streane*, Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue (1893), 10* Text, 33* Translation. As doubts have arisen on the subject, it may here be remarked in passing that the translations there given, pp. 21*–47*, were made by me, while *Laible's* contribution appears only in the rendering of Streane.

[5] The dictum forms a *crux interpretum* only for those who find the obvious sense disagreeable. It is correctly rendered by *Laible*, Jesus Christ im Talmud (1891), 48, and by *Bacher*, op. cit. 118; incorrectly, by *Levy*, Neuhebr. Wörterbuch under אָדָם; *Wünsche*, Der jerus. Talmud, 141; *M. Schwab*, Le Talmud de Jérusalem, vi. 156. The explanation of *F. Cohn* given by *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 50, is quite impracticable.

king of Babylon says: "I will ascend into heaven . . .; I will ascend above the cloudy heights, like to the Most High." Compare Mechilta, ed. Friedm. 39ᵇ: "Said Nebuchadnezzar: 'I will make me a little cloud and dwell therein.'"[1] As Abbahu can be proved to have come into contact with Christians, it is most natural to suppose that his statement was meant to refer to Jesus, and was not an admonition, practically useless in his time, against any other persons claiming to be God. The motive which leads him to make Num. 23[19] the basis of his assertion, despite the change of what he must have known to be the natural sense, can only be that the association of אֵל and בֶּן אָדָם seemed to him fitted to produce an allusion to Jesus. In that case he will have been aware that Jesus had called Himself "Son of man" in some exclusive sense. Of course it does not follow from the statement that "son of man" had become a Jewish name for the Messiah. Moreover, no reference is made to Dan. 7[13].

It may be noted that in the *Zohar*, the principal product of the Kabbala in the Middle Ages, vol. iii. 144ᵃ, a distinction is drawn on one occasion, with the help of a reference to כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, Dan. 7[13], and כְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם, Ezek. 1[26], between the "higher Adam" (אָדָם דִּלְעֵילָּא) and the "lower Adam" (אָדָם דִּלְתַתָּא). This, however, has no relation either to the first man or to the Messiah. The "higher Adam" is, on the contrary, the highest form of the self-revelation of God; the "lower Adam" is a synthesis of all the inferior stages of revelation subsumed under the former. This may in some way, no longer demonstrable by us, be historically connected with the doctrine of the Ophites, which gave to the primordial light the name of *Πρῶτος Ἄνθρωπος*, and to the *Ἔννοια*, which emanated from him, the name of *Δεύτερος*

[1] On account of Isa. 14[13f.] Nebuchadnezzar is supposed to stand for those who have given themselves out to be God, Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Schem. 12ᵃ f.; Schem. R. 8; cf. Ber. R. 9. An ascension of King Alexander is related by Jona (*c.* 330), j. Ab. z. 42ᶜ; Bem. R. 13.

"Ανθρωπος or υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.[1] Its genesis is doubtless to be found in Ezekiel's vision of the royal chariot, in which God appears in human semblance, to which a welcome parallel appeared for Jews in the heavenly בַּר אֱנָשׁ of Dan. 7^{13}, and for Christians in the self-designation of Jesus. The common opinion that Paul "simply" adopted[2] his designation of Christ as ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ or ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος[3] from the rabbinic theology is, however, erroneous, for their theology knew nothing of such a comparison between Adam and the Messiah. The proof-passages adduced by Schöttgen, Hor. hebr. et talm. 670 ff., and by J. Rhenferdius in Meuschen, Nov. Testam. ex Talmude illustr. 1048 ff., to support this idea, belong to the Middle Ages, and are influenced by the Kabbala.[4]

It may be set down as our result, that the son of man in Dan. 7^{13} was certainly understood sometimes to denote the Messiah; that, further, there were two apocalyptic fragments of an early period which used this name, excluding all other designations; but that a regular Jewish name for the Messiah never was formed from the passage in question.[5] There was no intrinsic hindrance to such a development. Why should "the son of man" be less adapted to become a Messianic title than the Jewish name חִוְרָא, "the leprous,"[6] for the Messiah, or הַמָּקוֹם, "the place,"[7] for God, or the Samaritan תֵּיבָה, "He who will come again," for the Messiah? But "son of man" as a Messianic title among the Rabbis

[1] Irenæus, i. 28; cf. *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 62 ff.

[2] See, *e.g.*, *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. ii. 55; *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 64.

[3] 1 Cor. $15^{45.47}$.

[4] This is the subject of remark also by *G. F. Moore* in "The last Adam," Journ. Bibl. Lit. xvi. (1897) 158–161.

[5] From the intermittent testimonies in Enoch and 2 Esdras, which were soon superseded among the Jews, one must not, of course, manufacture, like *Baldensperger*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 170 f., a "synagogal usage," which prevailed "almost universally in the religious works of the scribes."

[6] See "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 36.

[7] See above, p. 231 f.

LIBR OF T UNIVE OF CALIFO

was to be expected, solely on the condition that they had formed their conception of the Messiah principally from Dan. 7. As they did not do so, "the son of man" did not become a Messianic title.

3. "SON OF MAN" IS NO EMPTY FORMULA.

Beza, Cocceius, H. E. G. Paulus, and Fritzsche[1] had already put forward the view, which A. Meyer[2] revives, in regard to certain cases of the use of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, namely, that among the Jews it was simply a common substitute for the pronoun of the first person. Commenting on Matt. 8^{20}, Beza says: "(addo,) propterea quod familiare est Hebræis, ut de se loquantur in tertia persona, ideo accipi loco pronominis primæ personæ in evangelica historia." Still the custom of speaking of oneself in the third person was by no means general among the Hebrews. But it did happen that a man should speak of himself as הַהוּא גַּבְרָא, "this man," or a woman as הַהִיא אִתְּתָא, "this woman." Examples are seen in Vaj. R. 30; j. Maas. sch. 55^{b}; j. Sabb. 15^{c}; j. Sukk. 55^{b}; j. Mo. k. 81^{d}; j. Taan. 66^{d} 69^{a}; j. Kidd. 64^{b}; j. Keth. 29^{b}; b. Bab. b. 4^{a}; b. Sanh. 46^{b}.[3] The incentive to this mode of speech will have arisen in cases where something disagreeable had to be said,[4] although its use did not remain confined to such cases. A man, who is dying, gives instructions that something should be handed over to "the wife of this man," j. Kidd. 64^{b}. The Emperor Trajan, speaking of himself, j. Sukk. 55^{b}, says to the Jews whom he had taken by surprise: "This man, who proposed to come after ten days,

[1] See the references in *Appel*, Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu: Der Menschensohn, 5 f.

[2] Jesu Muttersprache, 95.

[3] See also Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 77 f., and Aram. Dialektproben, p. 18, lines 9, 12; p. 29, lines 7, 11, 13 f.

[4] "Thou" was also readily avoided; cf. the form of imprecation, "may the spirit of this man expire!" *e.g.* j. Bez. 14^{b}, and *Goldziher*, Abhandlungen zur arab. Philologie, i. 39.

has already arrived in five days." There is, however, no instance to show that הָהוּא אֱנָשָׁא or הָהוּא בַר אֱנָשָׁא was used in the same fashion. Still less would the simple בַּר אֱנָשָׁא be possible for this purpose. Any connection between the usage in question and the self-designation of Jesus is all the harder to establish, in view of the fact that at that time, as concluded above, under § 1, אֱנָשׁ and not בַּר אֱנָשׁ was the common term for "man."

The Hebrew אוֹתוֹ הָאִישׁ, "that man,"[1] had just as litttle to do with the title "son of man" as its Aramaic equivalent הָהוּא גַּבְרָא. Cremer[2] believes that the term "son of man," Enoch 69[29], may have arisen through opposition to the Jewish habit of referring to Jesus as אוֹתוֹ הָאִישׁ. But this way of alluding to Jesus is unknown in the ancient Rabbinism, and cannot be verified till the Middle Ages. This term implies only that the discussion treats of the person whose name the speaker does not wish, or in view of the Christian censorship does not dare, to mention.

What has been said tends only to prove that it should not seem specially remarkable, if Jesus showed a preference for speaking of Himself in the third person. But the term He employed for that purpose was an uncommon one; and it requires a special explanation.

4. "SON OF MAN" IS A SELF-APPELLATION OF JESUS USED EXCLUSIVELY BY HIMSELF.

In all three Synoptists ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a title of Jesus appears only in the words of Jesus Himself. Once indeed the fourth evangelist, 12[34], represents the people as speaking of the "Son of man," but only so as intentionally to attribute to them a repetition of the words of Jesus. According to Acts 7[56], Stephen at his martyrdom used the words; and according to Hegesippus (in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl.

[1] See Ber. R. 36.

[2] Bibl. Theol. Wörterbuch,[8] 966.

ii. 23), James also used the title in like circumstances. Both these instances, however, contain an unmistakable allusion to the language used by Jesus before the Sanhedrim, that of Stephen agreeing with Luke 22^{69}, that of James with Matt. 26^{64}. Nowhere else is Jesus named ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,[1] not even in Revelation, although it speaks on two occasions, in allusion to Dan. 7, of one who resembles a son of man. The seer beholds 1^{13} Jesus as ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου in a picture which recalls not Dan. 7, but Dan. $10^{5.6}$, and hence the term must be borrowed from Dan. $10^{16.18}$, where the narrative mysteriously speaks of "one like the appearance of a man." In Rev. 14^{14} the seer again beholds "one like unto a son of man," this time on a white cloud with a crown and a sickle about to "reap" the harvest of the earth. That Christ is referred to is not clearly stated; v.^{17} implies that it was an angel. The scene is not that of Dan. 7, which has only the cloud in common. Nevertheless the thought of the "one like to a son of man" of Dan. 7^{13} may here have floated before the mind of the writer. Although the seer depicts the heavenly aspect of Jesus and of an angel as being in the "form of a man," one cannot, of course, draw the conclusion that he was ignorant of the fact that Jesus, during His life on earth, had called Himself the "Son of man." One can only see a corroboration of the fact that even he, like the other New Testament writers, never uses ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a name for Jesus.

In 1 Thess. 4^{16}, 2 Thess. 1^{7}, Paul, having in view the kindred statements of Jesus in regard to the second coming of the Messiah, does not even here call Jesus "the Son of man," but ὁ κύριος. It is true he terms Christ ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (ὁ ἐπουράνιος), 1 Cor. $15^{47f.}$; but this expression, which Paul probably used here for the first time,

[1] With the same motive, however, the Liturgy of St. James in the ritual of the Eucharist, having treated 1 Cor. 11^{26} as an utterance of Jesus, has changed Paul's τοῦ κυρίου, which could not be supposed to have been said by Jesus, into τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

is occasioned by the contrast, which substantially determines the entire passage, instituted between the earthly nature represented in Adam and his posterity, and the heavenly nature bequeathed by Christ to them that are His. In this connection there is no more need to detect a reference to the self-designation of Jesus, than there is to see a use of the ideas of Philo or the Kabbala in regard to an ideal primitive man.[1]

The expression has clearly remained restricted to its use by Jesus Himself, and the Synoptists are themselves witnesses confirming this usage as a historical fact, as they never by any chance allow the term to glide into their own language. Even to the evangelists themselves it did not seem to be a regular Messianic title. The main point is to understand that Jesus alone called Himself "the Son of man," and that no one else did so. It is not a sign of a sound historical method to give up the attempt to solve this problem and to seize upon the contention of Oort[2] and Lietzmann, that the non-use of the term by the New Testament writers is a sign that it did not really belong to Jesus either, and further, that somewhere or other there had been an early community of Christian Hellenists which delighted in this name, and in order to find occasion for its use, represented Jesus in the evangelic narrative as frequently speaking of Himself in the third person. But any such assertion should have been prevented by the mere observation, that although the Gospels have proclaimed Jesus to the Church as "the Son of man" for 1800 years, yet the name has never to this day become a common title of Christ, and in books and sermons the "Son of man" is not usually spoken of save when the words of Jesus Himself are the cause. It is probable that substantially the same feeling, which to-day deters the Church

[1] That there can be no question of borrowing from the rabbinic theology, see above, p. 247 f.

[2] *H. L. Oort*, De uitdrucking *ο υιος του ανθρωπου* in het nieuwe Testament (1893).

from naming and invoking Jesus as "the Son of man," will have been active from the beginning.

The true reason for the non-use of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in the Greek-speaking Church is disclosed by Lietzmann himself, through the instances he has given to illustrate the sense attached to the title.[1] Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, as well as Tertullian, Ambrose, Cyprian, Augustine, with one consent, though in variously conceived modes, have seen in this title a reference to the human side in the descent of Jesus. As observed at the end of § 1, this interpretation of the name is not surprising. *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* could not be understood by Greeks otherwise than as referring to one who desires to be known as son of a man. A name of this sort for Jesus might, in the Greek-speaking Church, be regarded from a dogmatic standpoint; but it was not adapted for practical use.

5. THE MEANING ATTACHED TO THE TITLE BY THE SYNOPTISTS.

The first appearance of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is found, for Matthew in 8^{20} (cf. Luke 9^{58}), for Mark as early as 2^{10} (cf. Matt. 9^{6}, Luke 5^{24}), and for Luke in the passage just cited 5^{24}. None of the evangelists takes the trouble to explain the designation; they seem to assume that the reader would understand what was meant by it. Had they wished the reader to think of the Messiah who was to come in the clouds of heaven, one would suppose that they would at the outset have inserted an explanation declaring the Messianic majesty of the Son of man. In the case of Matthew, however, the introductory statement about the Son of man is, that He

[1] *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 69–80; see also *Appel*, Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu, 1–3.

lacks what even wild beasts possess; in Mark and Luke, that the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins. This latter the readers could not have understood as signifying that this power belonged of right to Jesus in virtue of His being the "Son of man," but as signifying that one, who was content to call Himself merely "a son of man," had received such absolute power. Matthew explicitly says as much in recording this incident, Matt. 9^{8}, when he represents the multitude giving praise because God had given such power "unto men." The same evangelist, by the modifications peculiar to himself which he introduces in his account of Peter's confession (*τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, 16^{3}, for *με*, Mark 8^{27}, Luke 9^{18}; *ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*, v.^{16}, for *ὁ Χριστός*, Mark 8^{29}; *τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*, Luke 9^{20}), makes it clear beyond doubt that He who calls Himself merely "Son of man" is in reality the correlative, *i.e.* Son of God.[1] Hence it is emphasised 16^{17} that Peter has acquired this conviction not from men, but from God. Even Jesus by calling Himself "Son of man" had clearly given him no aid in coming to this conclusion. When Mark and Luke, even sooner than Matthew, represent Jesus as using the self-appellation "Son of man," it is clear that they also can have seen in the title no assertion of Messianic majesty. The injunction of Jesus not to speak to any one of His Messianic character would, of course, seem meaningless to them, if Jesus habitually spoke of Himself in public as the Messiah, and that at the summit of the Messianic power, as inferred from Dan. 7^{13}. Again, there is also present an indication that "Son of man" refers to the Messiah in His estate of humiliation, in the account of Matthew and Mark concerning the unpardonable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The primary form of the utterance is seen in Mark, who merely contrasts blasphemy in general with blasphemy against the Spirit which inspired Jesus, $3^{28f.}$. Luke 12^{10} speaks

[1] *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 257 f., rightly emphasises this.

of blasphemy of the "Son of man" and of the "Spirit"; Matt. 12^{32} is similar, but the statement to this effect is annexed to another, which corresponds to the form found in Mark. It is impossible that Matthew and Luke should here intend to make a distinction between two Persons of the Godhead, as if it were a venial sin to blaspheme the "Son." The distinction is, on the contrary, between Jesus as man and the divine Spirit working through Him. Invective against the man Jesus may be forgiven; blasphemy against the divine power inherent in Him is unpardonable, because it is blasphemy against God.

Mark alone draws the inference, $2^{27f.}$, that the "Son of man" is lord even of the Sabbath, on the ground that the Sabbath was instituted for the sake of men. Hence, in the reasoning of Mark, what applies to mankind in general, applies pre-eminently to the "Son of man." In describing the trial of Jesus (Luke 22^{70}), Luke alone has the explanatory question: σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; which evidently connects itself with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the acknowledgment of Jesus. The addition implies that Jesus, as His declaration really means, is not indeed the "Son of man," but the "Son of God."

We will be justified in concluding that for the Synoptists, in harmony with the view of the early Church, "Son of man" was not a term denoting the majesty of the Messiah; but that it was, what any Hellenist must necessarily have taken it to be, an intentional veiling of the Messianic character under a title which affirms the humanity of Him who bore it. In their view, the prospect of sufferings foretold by Jesus as the part of the "Son of man" was no paradox, but the statements in regard to His exaltation were. It was a matter of surprise, not that the "Son of man" should be put to death, but that He should come again on the clouds of heaven.

6. THE SENSE ATTACHED BY JESUS TO THE TERM "SON OF MAN."

Owing to the diversified character of the sayings in which Jesus refers to Himself as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, investigation of the substance of these sayings leads to no result. Jesus nowhere gives any information defining the scope of the title. Such information He seems, therefore, to have regarded as uncalled for. One thing, however, is made clear by the testimony of the Synoptists, that, for their part, they assume that the title consistently bore one and the same sense. Thus we are directed in the next place to the term itself, which we have to bring into comparison with the testimony borne by Jesus to His own personality.

The Greek *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as understood by Greeks*, would necessarily be traced to בְּרֵהּ דֶּאֱנָשָׁא in Aramaic (see above, under § 1). But objections to the supposition that Jesus really used these Aramaic words, arise from the considerations that the phrase is not Semitic; that the meaning "the son of the man" has nowhere any support in the testimony of Jesus in regard to Himself; and that, further, no literary source can be discovered for such an expression, while every probability strongly favours the view that Jesus, in virtue of the scriptural expression of God's will concerning Himself, adopted the expression from the Old Testament. The only genuine Aramaic term which suggests *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is בַּר אֱנָשָׁא. This term, we have said under § 1, did *not* properly belong to the common language of the Palestinian Jews as a term for "man"; it was characteristic rather of the elevated diction of poetry and prophecy. To the Jews it will have been known purely as a biblical word. The Jewish hearer will therefore have had recourse in the first place to Scripture for an explanation of the strange use of בַּר אֱנָשָׁא on the lips of Jesus. And Scripture offered the like Aramaic expression only in Dan. 7^{13} כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, where

בַּר אֱנָשׁ denotes a definite personality, which, further, Jewish exegesis sometimes identified explicitly with the Messiah. We do not mean to say that every one would have been obliged to put this construction on the expression. The application of Dan. 7^{13} to the Messiah will not have been universal. Moreover, the "one like to a son of man" there mentioned, was to be brought down on the clouds of heaven in order to be master of the world. In the case of Jesus nothing resembling these circumstances was apparent. How could one, who moved about on earth, come down from heaven? A transference thither must first have occurred before that could be accomplished. One who had died or who had been translated from the earth, might perchance be again introduced into the world in this fashion, or a personality which never had been on earth might so descend. Thus it seemed impossible to apply Dan. 7^{13} to Jesus. Any one who remained fixed in this idea, provided he did not know that Jesus had in fact foretold for Himself death, resurrection, and a second advent in majesty, will probably have discarded the reference to Daniel as impossible, and henceforward have regarded the designation as an enigma. If the words used by Jesus had been הָהוּא בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, "this son of man," this would have been regarded as an expression, uncommon indeed, but implying modesty in Jesus. But if He named Himself "the Son of man," בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, then it could only follow that for some reason or other He regarded Himself as a man distinct from other men. On the other hand, no one would have entertained the notion that He was in any sense "the ideal man"; for this conception was far removed from Jewish thought, and was not brought nearer in the slightest by the teaching of Jesus.

In view of the obvious reference by Jesus to Dan. 7^{13} in His apocalyptic discourse, Matt. 24^{30} (Mark 13^{26}, Luke 21^{27}), and in His testimony before the Sanhedrin, Matt. 26^{64} (Mark 14^{62}), it can scarcely be doubted that Dan. 7^{13} was the source from which He took the self-designation. This origin is

further confirmed by the fact that it was also from Daniel that Jesus adapted the idea of the sovereignty of God. Nothing requires us to seek the source in the Similitudes of Enoch, especially as the "Son of man" there mentioned is never born as man;[1] while Daniel leaves this point unnoticed. Though such is the state of the case, we need not suppose that Jesus attached great importance to the intrinsic sense of the expression. His calling Himself "Son of man," בַּר אֱנָשׁ, really implied no more than that He was that one in whom this vision of Daniel was to proceed to its realisation. The term acquires its positive significance from the light in which it is placed by Daniel, and from what is said concerning it; just as the title מְשִׁיחָא, "the Messiah," derives its meaning not so much from the literal sense of the word, as from the scriptural testimony to the person thus entitled. But if all who heard the words of Jesus did not penetrate these associations, if there was a period when even the disciples of Jesus failed to understand them, the question arises, what aim Jesus had in view when He called Himself the "Son of man" before those to whom the term was an enigma? To such persons also He must, of course, have intended the term to convey some meaning. Or can it be that He never used the term at all before such persons?

Considerable difficulties stand in the way of discovering a true answer to these questions. In the first place, it cannot be said of any of the Gospels that they give us the sayings of Jesus in exact chronological sequence, especially as they differ widely one from another in this respect. From the first there will have been an earnest desire to be accurately informed as to the words and deeds of Jesus; but their succession in point of time appeared unimportant, and *in regard to sequence*, the recollection of the disciples would not always be able to furnish precise information. In the next place, their recollection, particularly in regard to the use of the title

[1] See above, p. 131.

"Son of man," cannot have been definite. It can scarcely be imagined that they should afterwards have known precisely on what occasions Jesus had and had not made use of this expression. The Synoptic tradition on this point is in itself ambiguous. The term is present in Matt. 16^{13}, but absent in the parallels, Mark 8^{27}, Luke 9^{18}; it is found in Luke 6^{22} 12^{8}, but not in Matt. 5^{11} 10^{33}; it occurs in Mark 10^{45} and Matt. 20^{28}, but not in Luke 22^{27}; Mark (8^{31}) and Luke (9^{22}) have it where Matthew (16^{21}) omits it. When all three Synoptists agree in using it, *e.g.* Matt. 9^{6} (Mark 2^{10}, Luke 5^{24}), the only inference that can be drawn is that a source common to them all had contained the title, but not that the tradition is here particularly certain. Such being the state of matters, it cannot be ascertained with absolute certainty when or to what class of persons Jesus first used the title.

As for the evangelists themselves, they take the view that Jesus called Himself the "Son of man" at all times and before any company. Thus the first case of its use, alike in Mark (2^{10}) and Luke (5^{24}), takes place in public. Before his account of the same occasion, Matt. 9^{6}, Matthew, too, has only one instance of its use (8^{20}), in an interpolation foreign to the context of the passage; and even there the title is used in speaking to one who wishes to become for the first time a follower of Jesus. A complete understanding of His self-appellation, Jesus could certainly not, in such cases, have looked for from His hearers. Yet one may hold that in using the title He purposely furnished them with a problem which stimulated reflection about His person, and gave such a tendency to this reflection that the solution of the problem fully revealed the mystery of the personality of Jesus. But though Jesus obviously showed a predilection for speaking to the multitude in parables and leaving[1] the explanation to themselves, the objection may perhaps be made to the sup-

[1] See Matt. 13^{34}, Mark 4^{34}.

position that He had from the first called Himself "Son of man," that His disciples must presumably in that case have asked and received a special explanation of the expression. But any such private explanation is inadmissible for any time prior to the Messianic acknowledgment made by Peter, Matt. 16^{16} (Mark 8^{29}, Luke 9^{20}), especially considering the saying of our Lord, which Matthew records 16^{17}, to the effect that God, and not man, had revealed to Peter the Messianic dignity of Jesus, and also the injunction given in Mark and Luke against speaking to the people on the subject. Thus Jesus cannot possibly have made Himself known as the Messiah at a previous period in any fashion fully transparent to the disciples. All the instructions concerning this subject which Matthew places earlier than the confession of Peter, must be relegated to the period following that confession; thus, above all, the exposition of the parable of the Tares in the Field, Matt. 13^{36-43}, on account of v.$^{41f.}$, unless it be assumed that it was originally God that was named where "Son of man" now stands; and further, Matt. 7^{21-23}, on account of vv.$^{22.\ 23}$; while the Lucan parallel to this, Luke 6^{46}, by not naming Jesus as the Judge of the world, is unobjectionable from this point of view; as well as Matt. 10^{17-25} on account of v.^{23b} ("till the Son of man be come"), and because the future separation of Jesus from the disciples, *i.e.* His death, is presupposed all through. Mark and Luke do, in fact, place the first intimation of the advent of Jesus in majesty subsequent to its necessary presupposition, which is the open announcement of His death, and also subsequent to the confession of Peter; see Mark 8^{38}, Luke 9^{26}, cf. Matt. 16^{27}. Thus, for the reasons indicated, one would be obliged to consider it probable[1] that Jesus had not previously referred to Himself as the "Son of man."

[1] Here I speak advisedly of probability only, because in the construction I proceed to put on the sense of the title, an absolute necessity for this supposition is *not* present. It would be finally convincing for those who take "Son of man" to be a distinctively Messianic title.

This conjecture may be vindicated, if need be, in view of the Synoptic testimonies, which seem to oppose it. Prior to the confession of Peter, Matthew records the use of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* nine times. Three of these instances, 10^{23} $13^{37.\,41}$, are discounted by what has just been said; and 8^{20}, as just remarked, is out of place in its present position. Matt. 12^{32} is to be regarded as an explanatory duplicate of v.[31].[1] The "sign of Jonah," Matt. 12^{40}, is not mentioned by Luke (11^{30}) till after the Petrine confession. Luke alone has the instance, 6^{22}, *ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, for which, however, Matthew has only *ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ* (5^{11}). Matthew and Luke have each the comparison between the Baptist and the Son of man, Matt. $11^{18f.}$ (Luke $7^{33f.}$). Matthew, Mark, and Luke have a paragraph in common, Matt. 9^{1-17} (Mark 2^{1-22}, Luke 5^{17-39}), to which is directly added in Mark and Luke a section (Mark 2^{23}–3^{6}, Luke 6^{1-11}) which Matthew has remitted to a later position (Matt. 12^{1-14}). In these parts all three Synoptists have *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* twice, Matt. 9^{6} (Mark 2^{10}, Luke 5^{24}) and Matt. 12^{8} (Mark 2^{28}, Luke 6^{5}). Thus we really have the title placed before the Petrine confession only three times.

J. Weiss, A. Meyer, Lietzmann, and Holtzmann have tried to set aside the evidence of two of these instances, by holding that Jesus had there spoken of mankind generally, or in such a way that something was applicable to Himself in virtue of His humanity. But this mode of interpretation would hardly have arisen unless there had been reasons independent of the passages themselves for desiring to supersede the title "Son of man" as a title. One of the two cases where Jesus claims for the "Son of man" the right to forgive sins, Matt. 9^{6} (Mark 2^{10}, Luke 5^{24}), has been pronounced meaningless by Weiss,[3] on the ground that "no opponent of Jesus had any doubt that the Messiah had full power to forgive sins." But, in the first place, as a Messianic title,

[1] Cf. p. 255.

[2] Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes, 57.

בַּר אֱנָשָׁא would hardly have been intelligible for such opponents on this occasion; and, besides, it is a fact which ought to have been familiar to J. Weiss, that Judaism never, from Old Testament times to the present day, has ventured to make any such assertion in regard to the Messiah. Still less does it signify anything important, that, according to Matthew (9^8), praise is given to God because He had given such power unto men, for this language merely brings into view the evangelist's own idea of the expression "Son of man."[1] Moreover, an implicit reference to the power of remitting sins given to the disciples, John 20^{23}, is, in spite of Matt. 16^{19} 18^{18}, inadmissible here.

With better reason, apparently, it may be said that mankind in general is meant by the "Son of man," who is Lord of the Sabbath, Matt. 12^8 (Mark 2^{28}, Luke 6^5), because in that case, according to Mark 2^{27}, the Sabbath has just previously been pronounced subservient to mankind. But this preceding sentence appears only in Mark;[2] in place of it Matthew has something different; Luke has nothing at all. If *brevior præferenda*, as standing closest to the original, is applicable here, then the shortest form is to be found in Luke, who gives us no occasion for thinking of mankind. Mark 2^{27} is an interpolation whose position is parallel to that of Matt. 12^{5-7}, which we have considered valid as indicating the sense attached by the evangelist to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; but it by no means implies that on this occasion Mark did not have in view the ordinary self-appellation of Jesus. It is also to be noted that the saying Luke 6^5, cf. Mark 2^{27}, has a fresh form of introduction καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, and that Matthew, by omitting it, brings the saying to notice very disconnectedly. To all appearance the saying about the Lord of the Sabbath was an independent *Logion* which has

[1] In opposition to *Lietzmann*, Der Menschensohn, 89. See above, p. 254.

[2] It is worthy of note that the saying of our Lord, Mark 2^{27}, does not appear at all in Cod. D.

been added here only through affinity in sense.[1] Originally Jesus will only have said that necessity justified the breach of Sabbatic law by the disciples, as in the case of David's irregular eating of the shewbread; but not that He, as Lord of the Sabbath, had authorised the act of the disciples. A declaration of this nature would have been more in place if Jesus Himself had set aside the Sabbatic regulations. Again, as regards the theory represented by Pfleiderer, J. Weiss, and J. H. Holtzmann, in the absence of any historical warrant in its support, one cannot consent to the idea that Jesus at first had merely called Himself "the Man," and then at a later period, by combining this with Dan. 7^{13}, had transformed it into a Messianic designation. Besides, the objection arises that "Man" and "Son of man" are not traceable to the same Aramaic expression, and it would also have to be explained why Jesus called Himself not אֲנָשָׁא but בַּר אֲנָשָׁא. Why should "man" in Mark 2^{27} be *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, but in v.[28] *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*?

A simpler and in itself an admittedly permissible method of explaining these passages satisfactorily, would be either to change the embarrassing *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* into the personal pronoun, or else to suppose that the sayings concerned should be located after Peter's confession. In support of the latter, it could be held that the paragraph alluded to as common to the three Synoptists, includes within it the allusion to the days when the bridegroom shall be taken away, which will give his friends occasion for fasting (Matt. 9^{15}, Mark 2^{20}, Luke 5^{35}). As Jesus here anticipates His death, the time of Peter's confession may be supposed to have preceded. Of course it by no means follows that Jesus Himself had only at that time acquired the knowledge of His violent death; still it does seem that He had not previously informed His disciples of it.

[1] Cod. D has not inserted it till the later narrative, Luke 6^{10}. In this passage it is also placed by Blass in his text of Luke, and by Resch in his *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ*. On the other hand, in Luke 6^{5} Cod. D has another *Logion* peculiar to itself.

Thus, then, it is not impossible, though it cannot be regarded as absolutely certain, that Jesus never called Himself the "Son of man" prior to the Messianic confession of Peter, and the instruction then given to His disciples in regard to His future destiny. From that time forward the title became significant to them as the name derived from Dan. 7^{13} for Him who was ordained to the sovereignty of the world. To the mass of the people Jesus did not manifest the full significance of the title, until in His open confession before the Sanhedrin, Matt. 26^{64} (Mark 14^{62}, Luke 22^{69}), He set all doubts at rest, and thereby supplied the judges with a possible pretext for pronouncing a sentence of death.

The more precise determination of the sense attached by Jesus to בַּר אֱנָשָׁא will have to be sought primarily, as indicated above, with the help of the Book of Daniel. Considering the general mode of thought peculiar to Jesus, the chief motive which led directly to the selection of the Book of Daniel, and the title it contains for the future lord of the world, is to be found in the fact that nowhere else is it asserted so unreservedly that the inevitable mutations of all earthly conditions are to be expected from the agency of God alone.[1] As a stone which no hand has unloosed from its native rock, so comes the sovereignty of God upon the world, in order to shatter every hostile sovereignty, Dan. $2^{34.\,45}$. From heaven comes one like unto a son of man in order that God may bestow as a gift universal dominion upon him, Dan. 7^{13}, cf. v.^{27}. Of the "violent" it is said, Dan. 11^{4}, that they are raised up to establish the vision, but are at the same time destined to ruin. In His own immediate neighbourhood Jesus had been an eye-witness of the fruitlessness of individual aggrandisement, and thus preferred not to be regarded as "Messiah" by the people; as they, in opposition to all Old Testament prophecy,[2] were looking for acts of political liberation and a forcible appropriation of the sove-

[1] Cf. above, p. 137 f.

[2] See on this point Fund. Ideas, XI. 1.

reignty by their Messiah. But there was still another reason why the title "Son of man" was specially appropriate to Jesus. The name Messiah denoted the Lord of the Messianic age in His capacity as Ruler; in reality it was applicable to the person so predestinated only when His enthronement had taken place, not before it. Suffering and death for the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity are in fact unimaginable, according to the testimony of the prophets. When Jesus attached to the Messianic confession of Peter the first intimation of His violent death, He did so in order to make it clear that the entrance upon His sovereignty was still far distant, and that the Messianic function of Jesus did not include, but distinctly excluded self-aggrandisement. But the "one like unto a son of man" of Dan. 7^{13} has still to receive the sovereignty. It was *possible* that he should also be one who had undergone suffering and death. At any rate, in disposition he is no user of force, no conqueror, no demolisher, but only a "son of man" whom God has taken under His protection and ordained to be great.[1] We find an idea somewhat akin to this conception in the Revelation of John, which delights to speak of Christ as τὸ *ἀρνίον*, "the Lamb," which offered itself to be slain without gainsaying. There, too, the prominent idea is the defencelessness which leads Him to endure all things which men, by the counsel of God, inflict upon Him. Jesus called Himself בַּר אֱנָשָׁא, not indeed as the "lowly one," but *as that member of the human race (Menschenkind), in his own nature impotent, whom God will make Lord of the world;* and it is very probable that Jesus found another reference[2] to the Son of man of Dan. 7 in the verses of Ps. $8^{5f.}$: "What is a man that Thou art mindful of him, and a son of man that Thou acceptest him, and permittest him to be but little less than God, and crownest him with glory

[1] Cf. the exposition of Dan. 7 given on p. 138 f.

[2] This view is supported by *V. Bartlet*, Expos., 6th Ser., iv. 435, and—excluding the reference to Dan. 7—by *F. Buhl*, Messianske Forjættelser, 236 f.

and honour, makest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands, and hast put all things under his feet?"

If this exposition of the term be correct, it follows: (1) that the sense attached by Jesus to the title is peculiar to Him alone, and is no mere counterpart of the idea in Enoch and 2 Esdras; (2) that humility and suffering can be predicated of בַּר אֱנָשָׁא as well as majesty; (3) that the meaning suggested by the title to those who did not suspect its connection with Dan. 7 was not unwarranted, because in any case they too must have concluded that Jesus disclaimed the rôle of usurper by His own efforts; (4) that it was *possible* that at first the disciples were content with this conception, and did not ask any further explanation from Jesus; (5) that the interpretation put upon the expression by the Hellenistic Synoptists and by the primitive Church, though in the narrower sense inexact, was not erroneous in so far as they found in it a testimony of Jesus to the reality of His human nature; and, further, (6) that the Church was quite justified in refusing, on its part, to give currency to the title; for in the meantime the "Son of man" had been set upon the throne of God, and was, in fact, no longer merely a man, but a Ruler over heaven and earth, "The Lord," as Paul in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and the Teaching of the Apostles in its apocalyptic statement, rightly designate Him who comes with the clouds of heaven.

Note.—For a long time I considered it possible that "Son of man" might be a paradoxical term for "Son of God." Various Jewish phrases might have been adduced as parallels.[1] According to Yokhanan ben Zakkai (*c.* 80 A.D.), the thief is more severely punished by the law than the robber, "because he, as it were, treats the eye of God as unseeing and the ear of God as deaf." In Tosephta Bab. k. vii. 2, the "eye of God" is in this case expressed by "the eye that is above"

[1] Cf. *E. Landau*, Die gegensinnigen Wörter im Alt- und Neuhebr. (1896).

(עַיִן הָעֶלְיוֹנָה); but Mechilta Mishp. Nez. 15[1] and Bab. k. 79[b] says: "the eye that is beneath" (עַיִן שֶׁלְּמַטָּה). A tradition, not included in the Mishna (Baraitha),[2] given b. Yom. 77[a], b. Sukk. 53[b], explains Ezek. 8[16] by saying that the men unveiled themselves "downward" (כְּלַפֵּי מַטָּה), whereas the meaning really is "upward" (their heads), *i.e.* towards God. Even in the Old Testament, *e.g.* 1 Kings 21[10], "to bless," בֵּרַךְ, is said instead of "to curse" when the malediction is applied to God. In the same way בִּרְכַּת הַשֵּׁם, "blessing of the Name," b. Sanh. 56[a] (Baraitha), is really "blasphemy against God"; בִּרְכָה לְמַעְלָה, "blessing of what is above," means "cursing God"; בִּרְכָה לְמַטָּה, "blessing of what is below," on the other hand, means "cursing of parents," b. Yeb. 101[a] (Chanina). A blind man was called in Galilee סַנְיָא נְהוֹרָא, "the clear seer," Ber. R. 30, j. Peah 19[a], j. Keth. 34[b], or also נַבְרָא מְפַתְּחָא, "the man whose eyes are opened," j. Kidd. 61[a]. When anything discreditable to Israel has to be said, it is predicated of "the enemies of Israel," see in Hebr. שׂוֹנְאֵיהֶם שֶׁלְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, Mechilta, ed. Fried. 3[a], Tos. Sukk. ii. 6 (Meïr, *c.* 160 A.D.[3]); in Aram. שָׂנְאֵיהוֹן דְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, j. Chag. 77[d]; j. Sanh. 23[c]; Targ. Esth. ii. 1[1]. In like circumstances a man does not speak of himself but of "his enemy"; see b. Sukk. 52[a], b. Sanh. 107[a], where מַאן דְּסָנֵי לִי, "he, who hates me," is employed for "I."—All this, however, scarcely warrants the imputation of a paradoxical use of "Son of man" by Jesus; and as such a supposition is in no way indispensable in explaining the designation, it must be set aside.

[1] Ed. Constantinople, 1515, not in ed. Friedm. (91[b]).
[2] Cf. the saying of Chijja, Schir. R. 1[6]; *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Am. ii. 195.
[3] *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 28.

X. THE SON OF GOD.

1. THE SECOND PSALM IN JEWISH LITERATURE.

The second Psalm is generally reckoned the principal biblical source of the designations, "Son of God" and "Anointed" (Messiah), as applied to the King of the Messianic age. It will therefore be appropriate to begin by tracing the influence of this psalm on Jewish literature.

In Ps. 2^{7} the king of Zion, whom the poet had spoken of in v.^{5} as God's "Anointed" (מְשִׁיחוֹ), is called by God His Son (בְּנִי), begotten by Him on the coronation day. This language should probably be taken in connection with the promise in 2 Sam. 7^{14}, which says that God will stand to the Davidic dynasty in the relation of father to son. But while in 2 Sam. 7^{14} the inference from this promise is merely that God will keep the dynasty under discipline without overthrowing it, the psalm deduces from the filial relation of the king of Zion to God, that universal dominion originally proper to God is bequeathed to the Son as an inheritance, and in this respect goes further than Ps. 89^{28}, according to which the firstborn of God is only the highest of the kings of the earth. To me it seems likely that in both psalms, as in Isa. $55^{4.5}$, the king of Zion is meant as an emblem of God's people collectively. In Jewish literature, however, there are but few traces of such an interpretation. In the Midrash to Ps. 2^{12} [1] it is said at the end: "Whom does this resemble? The king, who is angry with the people of the land, and the people go and appease the son of the king, that he may appease the king. And when the people go to render a song of praise to the king, he says to them: Is it

[1] In this comment, therefore, בַּר is actually understood to be "Son." But בְּנוֹ must apparently be regarded as the original reading. The fear that in v.^{12} one might think of the anger of the Son, and of refuge with the Son, may have led to the change into בַּר, which in that case, from its first appearance, would have meant "purity."

to me that ye would sing praise? Go and say it to my son, as, but for him, I had long ago exterminated the people of the land. Even so God says to the Gentiles when they wish to render Him a song of praise . . .: Go, say it to the Israelites, for without them ye could not endure for one hour."[1] The date and source of the saying are unknown. The meaning of another saying, given in Midr. Ps. 2^{7}, is ambiguous. It represents that the divine statement in this verse is qualified by statements in each of the three divisions of Scripture; in the Law Ex. 4^{22} ("Israel is my son, my firstborn"), in the Prophets Isa. 52^{13} and 42^{1}, and in the Hagiographa Ps. 110^{1} 2^{7}, Dan. 7^{13}.[2] Judging by the citation from the Pentateuch, it appears as if Israel were meant throughout.

The Messianic interpretation of the psalm is not found so frequently as might have been expected. The *Book of Enoch* originally contained no allusion whatever to Ps. 2, which justifies an inference that a non-Messianic view of the psalm was common enough. The Similitudes of Enoch make use of Ps. 72, but not Ps. 2, in delineating the Messianic picture. In the unique expression (48^{10}), "the Lord of spirits and His Anointed," the second part should be deleted. For if not, the language here, "they have disowned the Lord of spirits," would be inapplicable to the Messiah, see 41^{2} 45^{2} 46^{7}.

So, too, Enoch 52^{4} is clearly an interpolation, as it breaks the natural connection between vv.[3] and [5]. Accordingly the reference to the Messiah as "His (God's) Anointed," which appears there, is also foreign to the original. Moreover, in this section of Enoch, the Messiah is elsewhere called consistently, according to Ps. $89^{4.\,20}$, "the Chosen," see 49^{4} $51^{3.\,5}$ $52^{6.\,9}$. To a later insertion we must also ascribe 105^{2}, in

[1] Thus in ed. Constant. 1512, and ed. Venice, 1546. Buber, in ed. Wilna, 1891, does not mention this reading, and has in its place "the world." According to Yalkut Shim. ii. (ed. Salonica, 1521) 624, it is said: "Ye would not continue to exist in this world."

[2] Dan. 7^{13} is not cited in the parallel, Yalk. Shim. ii. 621.

which case "I and My Son" might also, for that matter, be derived from Ps. $89^{27f.}$.

Among the earlier sections of the *Apoc. of Baruch*, chap. 27–29 did not originally mention the Messiah. The name occurs, indeed, in 29^3 and 30^1; but in 29^3 He only "begins to become manifest," and 30^1 says that "He comes again." Of His actual governance one hears nothing. Both passages must therefore be struck out. On the other hand, the expression "mine (God's) anointed" is twice used in the section chaps. 36–40 (39^7 40^1), also twice in the section chaps. 53–74 (70^9 72^2), but no allusion is made to Ps. 2. In 70^9 the Messiah is called "my Servant, the Anointed" (Syr. עבדי משיחא); but the whole verse may possibly be a gloss; see R. H. Charles on the passage. In 2 *Esdras* "the Messiah" (Syr. משיחא) appears in 12^{32} just as in Apoc. of Bar.—without allusion to Ps. 2. In $7^{28.\ 29}$ God calls the Messiah "Mine anointed Son" (Syr. ברי משיחא), but no indication is given as to the source of this language. In the vision of the "man from the sea" God further speaks of the Messiah as בְּרִי, "My Son," $13^{32.\ 37.\ 52}$ 14^9. In this vision there occur references to Dan. 2, Dan. 7, and Isa. 11^4. The stone cut out without hands, Dan. 2, which became a mountain, on which the Messiah takes up his position, and against which the peoples assemble, $13^{35f.}$, must be Zion; and this identification implies the influence of Ps. 2 in this passage. Still this influence is not clearly marked.

There is, however, an indubitable reference to Ps. 2 in the *Psalter of Solomon* 17^{26}, perhaps also in 18^{18} (cf. Ps. 2^9); and hence arises the possibility, though not the necessity, of tracing also the designations *Χριστὸς κύριος*,[1] 17^{36}; *Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ*, 18^6; *Χριστοῦ κυρίου*, 18^8, back to the second Psalm. In this book, however, the Messiah is not referred to as "Son of God."

[1] This depends, according to 18^6, upon the Hebr. מְשִׁיחַ יהוה, "the Anointed of the Lord," as does also *Χριστοῦ κυρίου*, 18^8.

Later Jewish literature affords in a Baraitha given in b. Sukk. 52[a] an earlier witness for the Messianic interpretation of Ps. 2. In this case vv.[7] and [8] are attributed to Messiah, Son of David. More recent is the saying of Yonathan ben Eleazar (*c.* 240):[1] "of three persons it is said in Scripture, 'Ask!' Who are they? Solomon and Ahaz and the King Messiah." For the last, reference is then made to Ps. 2. From the Midrash Ps. 2[7] it appears that Judan (*c.* 350) applied this verse to the Messiah. From a very late period, doubtless, arises the anonymous assertion contained in the same passage, which is directed against the exposition maintained by the Church. It runs thus: "From this verse (Ps. 2[7]) we find a retort against the Minim (Christians), who say that the Holy One, Blessed be He, has a Son; and thou canst remonstrate that the words are not 'a son art thou to me,' but 'thou art my son,' like a servant to whom his lord vouchsafes encouragement, saying to him, 'I love thee as my son'!"[2] (מְחַבְּבָנָא לָךְ כִּבְרִי).[3] In an addition to the saying of Huna about the sufferings of Messiah, which appears in the sources mentioned, the "begetting" is understood to be the "new creation"[4] undergone by the suffering Messiah, as a necessary prelude to His advent in majesty. The Targum for Ps. 80[16] has identified the "Son" with the Messiah, having clearly had Ps. 2 in view.

One may assume that as time passed the Christian ex-

[1] Ber. B. 44; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. p. Am. i. 83.

[2] So, too, the Targum of the Psalms has in 2[7] "dear as a son to a father art thou to me, innocent as if I had this day created thee."

[3] This is the reading in Yalk. Shim. ii. 621, ed. Salonica, 1521; Midr. Ps., ed. Constantinople, 1512, and ed. Venice, 1546. The Censor Dominico Caresso (1607) has blackened a part of the beginning in my copy of Yalkut; in ed. Frankf. a. M. 1687 the whole is omitted. Buber, who besides the old editions made use of 8 MSS. in preparing his edition of the Midrash Tehillim (Wilna, 1891), suppresses all the first part of the statement, without mentioning even its existence!

[4] See above, p. 178 f. The text of the Midrash on the Psalms would have us suppose that the creation of the hitherto non-existent Messiah is meant. It should, however, be emended in accordance with Yalk. Shim.; see my treatise, "Der leidende u. d. sterb. Messias," 52.

position of Ps. 2 became a deterrent to its common use by the synagogue. But even for the earlier period it must be recognised as certain that Ps. 2 was not of decisive importance in the Jewish conception of the Messiah, and that "Son of God" was not a common Messianic title. A hindrance to the use of בַּר אֱלָהָא or בֶּן הָאֱלֹהִים would have presented itself in the custom of not uttering the name of God; and this afterwards shows itself when Mark 14[61] gives the words of the Jewish high priest as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ*—a form ill adapted to become a current Messianic title. When God calls the Messiah His Son, this is merely meant as a sign of the exceptional love with which He above others is regarded. Even the idea of the "heritage" combined with sonship in Ps. 2 is never developed by Jewish literature in its bearing on the Messiah.

It is a peculiar mark of great importance in Israel, that divine descent was never ascribed either to the people or to their kings. In naming God its Father, it may occasionally contemplate a genesis through the agency of divine power (see p. 184). But divine nature in the Son is never deduced from such expressions. If Ps. 2 and Ps. 89 refer to the people Israel, it is still a special relation to God that is thereby asserted, the originator of this relationship being God, and by no means any sort of procreation in the literal sense of the word. Even in Messianic expositions, an Israelite will always have taken the title "Son of God" in a figurative sense, there being no incentive in this connection to interpret it otherwise than was usual elsewhere.

The language used by Israel recalls that of Assyria. When Asshurbanipal in his Annals,[1] according to the inscriptions, calls himself "an offspring of Asshur and Bilit," this means no more than a being destined from birth to the royal power. The kings of Egypt, on the contrary, were reckoned to be real "descendants of the god Ra." Even the birth of

[1] *Schrader*, Keilinschriftl. Bibliothek, ii. 152 f.

each king seems to be regarded as a special act of the gods; the royal title might contain the sentence:[1] "on the day of his birth there was exultation in heaven; the gods said, 'we have begotten him'; the goddesses said, 'he went forth from us.'"

The royal style of old Egypt was continued by the Ptolemies. Hence one encounters in connection with them epithets like "a diis genitus," "filius Isidis et Osiris," *υἱὸς τοῦ Ἡλίου*,[2] *θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ θεᾶς*.[3] Roman emperors also boasted frequently of divine progenitors. Sextus Pompeius called himself the son of Neptune; Domitian, the son of Minerva; Caligula and Hadrian deemed themselves to be earthly manifestations of Zeus.[4] In the royal title, however, there appeared only "Divus," in Greek *θεός*,[5] Aram. אֱלָהָא,[6] which, in the East, people applied without scruple to the living emperor, whereas it was originally intended to apply only to the emperor when transferred by death to a place among the gods. Augustus, it is true, called himself "Divi filius,"[7] *θεοῦ υἱός*;[8] but that has nothing really to do with divine sonship. It was a term due to his modesty, which prompted him to be known[9] as merely the "son of one who was transferred to a place among the gods," his father by adoption being Cæsar, now taken to be a Divus. Hence no assistance can be derived from this designation in determining the Greek conception of the term *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* used by Jesus.[10]

[1] *A. Erman*, Ägypten, 90 f. [Eng. tr.].

[2] *E. Beurlier*, De divinis honoribus quos acceperunt Alexander et successores ejus (1890), 47, 59.

[3] Corp. Inscr. Græc. 4697.

[4] *E. Beurlier*, Essai sur le culte rendu aux Empereurs Romains (1890), 10, 37 f.

[5] See, *e.g.*, Wadd. 2075, 2076, 2380, 2585, 2598; Corp. Inscr. Græc. 2176, 2177.

[6] See de Vogüé, 15, 16.

[7] Äg. Urkunden a. d. kgl. Mus. Berlin (Greek), 628.

[8] Ibid. 174, 543; Wadd. 1476.

[9] Cf. *Beurlier*, Essai, 13, 15.

[10] In opposition to Deissmann, Bibelstudien, 166 f. [Eng. tr. p. 166 f.].

2. THE TITLE "SON OF GOD" AS APPLIED TO JESUS BY OTHER PERSONS.

In the *Synoptic* Gospels, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* is found as a Messianic title in the confession of Peter, Matt. 16[16] (*ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*). Luke, however, has (9[20]) *τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*, and Mark (8[29]) has merely *ὁ Χριστός*. As the name *ὁ Χριστός* is the one which we should naturally expect in the mouth of a Jew at that period, we must regard Matthew's version as an expansion.[1]

In Matt. 14[33] it may certainly be admitted that the confession *θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ* is not inappropriately attributed to the disciples after Jesus had shown Himself to be master of wind and waves. But as it is straightway asserted, Mark 6[51f.], that the disciples did not thus express themselves on that occasion, a sufficiently sure foundation for the utterance disappears. In the mouth of the high priest, Matt. 26[63], the designation *ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (like *ὁ Χρ. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ*, Mark 14[61]) is unsuitable; because the words, as given by Luke (22[66]), *ὁ Χριστός*, or perhaps *ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ*, have antecedent probability in their favour. In the second question of the judges, "art thou then the Son of God?" Luke 22[70], the evangelist has made the decisive element in the acknowledgment of Jesus patent to his readers, but in so doing has really obscured rather than elucidated the actual circumstances.[2]

The railing addressed to Christ on the Cross is represented in Matthew (27[40], cf. v.[43]) by the words, "save thyself if thou art the Son of God." Luke has (22[35]): "if this is the chosen Christ of God." The conditional clause does not appear at all in Mark (15[30]). This clause appears to be an echo of the account of the Temptation, which also is related only by Matthew and Luke (see below). The centurion

[1] See on the same point, pp. 183, 196, 200, 291.
[2] On this point see XI. 2.

makes the confession after the death of Jesus that He was the "Son of God," *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, Matt. 27[54], Mark 15[39]; whereas, according to Luke (23[47]), he merely calls Jesus "guiltless" (*δίκαιος*). While the synoptic tradition is in itself discordant as regards the instances just named, it is uniform in testifying that the demoniacs named Jesus "the Son of God," Matt. 8[29] (Mark 5[7], Luke 8[28]), Mark 3[11], Luke 4[41]. It is evident, however, from Luke 4[41], that the evangelist here regards *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* as simply a synonym for *ὁ Χριστός*. Even in the country of the Gerasenes Jews would have been numerous enough, so that an appellation of Jesus as Messiah by the demoniacs settled there is not unnatural. Thus *ὁ Χριστός* would have to be substituted for the uncommon *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. It is conceivable that in such a case the evangelic narrative should, without reserve, make use of the explanatory title "Son of God." In relation to these spirits, Jesus was conceived not so much the "Messiah" as the One in whom God appears upon earth.

From the foregoing, it appears that Jesus was not called "the Son of God" by any contemporary. Seeing that this was not in common use as a Messianic title, as demonstrated under § 1, this result is quite natural. I have not here considered Satan's designation of Jesus as "Son of God" in the account of the Temptation, Matt. 4[3. 6] (Luke 4[3. 9]). It stands in close connection with the divine voice at the Baptism, to which the words of Satan, "if thou art the Son of God," obviously refer. The voice from heaven at the Baptism requires a separate discussion. Except for this association, it would be possible here also to put *ὁ Χριστός* for *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*.

Unnoticed still remain the words of the angel in Luke 1[32] and 1[35]. In the former verse, *υἱὸς ὑψίστου* taken along with *μέγας* merely emphasises the exalted distinction which falls to him whom the Most High deigns to name His "Son." The latter verse expressly connects *υἱὸς θεοῦ* with the supernatural birth of Jesus. We are not here called to consider

the historical value of the narrative in Luke's first chapter. We have merely to note the fact that the wording of the angelic message is in conformity with the biblical style[1] adopted by Luke for this narrative; and it therefore serves all the more surely as a means of ascertaining the evangelist's own interpretation of the idea *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. The second saying of the angel cannot in any case be brought into relation with Jewish popular notions. For the Jewish common people never expected the Messiah to be born of a virgin; and no trace is to be found among the Jews of any Messianic application of Isaiah's words (7^{14}) concerning the virgin's son, from which by any possibility—as some have maintained—the whole account of the miraculous birth of Jesus could have derived its origin.

3. THE DIVINE VOICE AT THE BAPTISM AND THE TRANSFIGURATION.

On two occasions Jesus is called by God "His Son,"—at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration. The words are: *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός*, Matt. 3^{17} (Mark 1^{11}, Luke 3^{22}) and 17^{5} (Mark 9^{7}, 2 Pet. 1^{17}; but in Luke 9^{35} Sin. B, *ὁ υ. μ. ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος*[2]). There is added, Mark 1^{11} (Luke 3^{22}), *ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα* (Matt. 3^{17} 17^{5} *ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*, 2 Pet. 1^{17} *εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα*). Moreover, there is a reading for Luke 3^{22} which is supported by D, Justin, Clem. Alex.: *υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*. This form has been considered by Blass[3] to be the parent of both forms of the Lucan text and adopted into his text. The gospel of the Ebionites, according to Epiphanius, Hær. 30, had both forms side by side.[4] In the gospel of the Hebrews, Jerome[5]

[1] See above, p. 39; and on *υἱὸς ὑψίστου*, p. 199.

[2] Of the Syriac versions, only the Sinaitic has this reading; Cur., Pesh., Jerus., like ACD, have *ὁ ἀγαπητός*.

[3] *F. Blass*, Evangelium secundum Lucam (1897), xxxvii. f., 14.

[4] *Nestle*, Nov. Test. Suppl. 75.

[5] See Jerome on Isa. 11^{4}.

read: "tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum."

The two forms represented in the canonical Gospels have both been moulded in the language of the Old Testament. The second, which is based from beginning to end on Ps. 2^7, might be disallowed as originating in the interests of the idea that Jesus had only then become the Son of God when He was baptized.[1] But this reading may equally well have arisen as an afterthought, because, apart from the doctrinal preconception, it was all too probable that the divine words which recalled Ps. 2^7 should be made to agree with the terms of the psalm.

In the former expression it is surprising that the divine good pleasure should be expressly declared towards the "beloved Son." Such a declaration seems superfluous, as this Son is not to be compared with other sons. In the case of a servant who is to be marked out from fellow-servants, the language is natural enough. In addition to this, the terms used by the divine voice recall Isa. $42^{1\,2}$ in the form in which it is reproduced[3] in Matt. 12^{18} *ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ᾑρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν ηὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου· θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ.* The Targum also shows a readiness to render Hebr. בָּחַר, "to choose," by אִתְרְעֵי, "to be well-pleased with"; see Isa. 43^{10} עַבְדִּי אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתִּי, Targ. עַבְדִּי מְשִׁיחָא דְאִתְרְעִיתִי בֵּיהּ, "my servant, the anointed, in whom I am well-pleased," cf. 41^8 $44^{1.\,2}$. The bestowal of the Spirit, mentioned in Isa. 42^1, is clearly the motive for the allusion to this prophetic statement. What Isa. 42^1 says of the servant of God was now being fulfilled. In that case *παῖς μου* in

[1] Proposed by Conybeare, Jew. Quart. Rev. ix. 463.

[2] Prov. 3^{12} sounds similar: "Whom the Lord loveth, He reproveth; even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (וּכְאָב אֶת בֵּן יִרְצֶה). The LXX, however, renders (cf. Heb. 12^6): *μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται*, and there is no reference to the gift of the Spirit.

[3] The LXX has: *Ἰακὼβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου· ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει.*

Isa. 42[1], which stands for the Hebr. עַבְדִּי, "my servant," would be taken to mean "a child." This is not surprising. In Acts 4[25. 26] there is a citation of Ps. 2[1] which v.[27] applies to the opposition of the Jewish authorities against "*τὸν ἅγιόν σου παῖδα Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας.*" The word *παῖς* here applied to Jesus, as also in v.[30] and in 3[13. 26], is rendered in the Peshita by בר, "son."—And since the Teaching of the Apostles regards Jesus (10[6], cf. Matt. 21[9]) not as the son of David, but as the God of David,[1] conformably with Ps. 110[1] and Matt. 22[45], it can hardly be imagined that, in the same eucharistic prayers which so speak of Him, Jesus should, with reference to God, be called "Thy servant."[2] The word *παῖς* used concerning Jesus, Teaching Ap. 9[2. 3] 10[2], will therefore mean "child," despite the fact that 9[2] (cf. Acts 4[25]) contains the same term applied to David. This meaning is unmistakable in Clement of Rome, whose letter to the Corinthians, 59[2f.], twice has the formula: *διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπημένου παῖδος αὐτοῦ (σου) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, cf. 59[4] *Ἰ. Χρ. ὁ παῖς σου.* The rendering "His (Thy) beloved child" is here obviously necessary, and an allusion to the voice at the Baptism and Transfiguration cannot be doubted. See also *ὁ μονογενὴς παῖς*, Clem. Alex., Strom. vii. 1.

Not less clearly does the Wisdom of Solomon[3] treat *παῖς* and *υἱός* as equivalent. The righteous man who names himself *παῖς κυρίου* (2[13]), prides himself, according to 2[16], that God is his father; and the wicked wish to test whether he really is what he professes to be, namely, *υἱὸς θεοῦ* (2[18]). Hence the Syriac version rightly enough has rendered both

[1] It is remarkable that the closing formula in the petition for redemption in the Palestinian Shemoneh Esreh (Eighteen Benedictions) should speak of Him who was to send the Branch of David as the "God of David" (אֱלֹהֵי דָוִד); see j. Ber. 8[c], and the Palestinian recension of the Prayer, "Messianische Texte," No. 6[a].

[2] In itself and in another environment there would be no objection to this designation; see עַבְדִּי מְשִׁיחָא, "My Servant the Messiah," in Targ. Isa. 42[1] 43[10] 52[13], Zech. 3[8].

[3] See "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 31.

2^{13} and 2^{18} by "Son of God," ברה דאלהא. The Israelites are "sons" (*υἱοί*) of God, 12^{19}, and in v.^{20} "children" (*παῖδες*). In this case the Syriac translator notices the difference between *υἱοί* and *παῖδες*; but just after, v.^{25}, he feels obliged to render *παῖδες* by טליא, "children." The attitude of the Book of Wisdom is the more important on this point, because it contains undoubted references to the "Servant of the Lord" of Isa. 53. *παῖς κυρίου* in this author must necessarily be traced back to the "servant" (עֶבֶד) of God in Isa. 40–66,[1] for which term the LXX, as a rule, is wont to put *παῖς*.[2] The same misinterpretation of the word *παῖς* in the Greek Old Testament, where it stands for "servant," was easily possible to any one who did not know the Bible in Hebrew. If this be the author's view of *παῖς* in Acts, chaps. 3 and 4, then these chapters were the work of a Hellenist who wrote in the style of the Greek Bible.

The same confusion of *παῖς* and *υἱός* cannot be asserted without further consideration in regard to the divine voice at the Baptism and Transfiguration, because in this case it is not *παῖς* but *υἱός* that is used. But it becomes comprehensible how an original designation of Jesus as *ὁ υἱός μου*, which must be considered as constituting the essence of the divine utterance, since it stands in both forms of the text (see also *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, John 1^{34}), was susceptible of an extension on the lines not only of Ps. 2^{7} but also of Isa. 42^{1}, tending to make the sense of the shorter phrase clearer, and commensurate with the importance of the occasion. And since the bestowal of the Spirit, mentioned in Isa. 42^{1}, will have been the reason for citing this particular passage of Scripture, it need not be assumed that the conventional form of the text was originally present in the account of the Transfiguration. On the contrary, the utterance at the Baptism has exercised an influence on that at the Trans-

[1] For additional proofs of the use of Isa. 40–66, see ibid. 32.

[2] Exceptionally the LXX has *δοῦλος*, 42^{19} 48^{20} $49^{3.\,5}$.

figuration, as even the present text of Matthew indicates by adopting in 17^5 the supplement *ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*.

In these circumstances there is no occasion for inquiry as to the Aramaic original. A translation of the divine words (at the Baptism) based on the Greek of Mark would have to be: אַתְּ בְּרִי [1] חֲבִיבִי אִתְרְעִיתִי בָךְ.

The first conclusion to be drawn from the tenor of the divine declaration at the Baptism is that He who was exceptionally endued with the Divine Spirit is in a special sense the object of the love and good pleasure of God. The evangelists give an account of the voice, not on account of any importance which the reception of such a divine voice might possibly have for Jesus, but in the sense of impressive testimonies that Jesus really was what His disciples before the world proclaimed Him to be.

Hence it is clear that the voice is intended to signify the divine good pleasure, not towards the person of Jesus as such, but towards Him as the agent of a special mission. This view is obviously presupposed by the injunction, "hear ye Him," appended to the account of the Transfiguration. This recalls the divine mandate of Deut. 18^{15}, to "hearken unto," that is, to obey, the Prophet who was to be raised up by God. Thus, however, we are directed to that position which Jesus Himself felt conscious of occupying as "the Son of God."

4. JESUS' OWN TESTIMONY.

Jesus never applied to Himself the title "Son of God," and yet made it indubitably clear that He was not merely "*a*" but "*the* Son of God." The position assumed shows itself in the preference He manifested for the designation of God as "His" Father, in the use of which He never includes the disciples along with Himself. In the prayer which He gave as an example to the disciples, it is only in Matthew

[1] Cf. Jer. 31^{19} יֶלֶד שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים, Targ. בַּר חֲבִיב, LXX *υἱὸς ἀγαπητός*.

(6[9]) that the words are: *πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. But not merely Luke, as Holtzmann[1] affirms, but also Matthew, places it beyond doubt that Jesus in this case merely puts this expression in the mouth of His disciples; He does not pray with them in these terms. This distinction is made obvious by the explanation added about forgiveness by Matthew, in which the form "your heavenly Father" is at once resumed. But the unique position assumed by Jesus also follows in other passages from the invariable separation between "my Father" and "your Father."[2]

What Jesus understands by the filial relationship peculiar to Himself is perceived with special distinctness from the parable of the Vineyard let out to Husbandmen, Matt. 21[33–46] (Mark 12[1–12], Luke 20[9–19]). Here He sharply distinguishes the only "son" as the sole heir from the whole series of servants. Mark 12[6] calls this son *ἕνα υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν*; Luke 20[13] *τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν*; Matt. 21[37] has merely *τὸν υἱόν μου*. It should here be recalled that the LXX puts *τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν*, Gen. 22[2], for Hebr. אֶת בִּנְךָ אֶת יְחִידֶךָ; Onk. יָת בְּרָךְ יָת יְחִידָךְ, "thine only Son," and hence there is no difference between *ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός* and *ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής* of John 3[16]. The position of the only son is, in these cases as in Ps. 2, regarded as a lawful standing which confers a right to claim the entire household property. In the case of the Son of God the reference can only be to the sovereignty of the world, and to such a sovereignty as would be exercised not by a Jewish emperor, but by a divine Sovereign.

A kindred idea appears in Matt. 17[25], where Jesus asks whether the kings of the earth exact tribute from their own

[1] Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 268. In Holtzmann's opinion, Jesus could not have spoken as in Luke 11[4] of real *ἁμαρτίαι*, but only as in Matt. 6[12] of *ὀφειλήματα*, in the sense of defects such as would have been inevitable in His earthly existence. But Aramaic requires חוֹב as the original; and this term, literally meaning "guilt," is in that language quite a common term for "sins." See Ex. 10[17], Hebr. שָׂא נָא חַטָּאתִי, "forgive, I pray thee, my sin"; Onk. שְׁבוֹק כְּעַן חוֹבִי, "pardon now my guilt."

[2] See above, p. 190.

LIBRARY OF THE

sons; and the thought is, that as this is quite unusual, even so the heavenly King, God, will not exact tribute from His Son. The question whether the tax was being paid had been asked with reference to Jesus only, and therefore the statement which followed cannot further include Peter than to the extent that he might, as an adherent of the Son, be reckoned as exempted like his Master from the tax. Here, too, Jesus separates Himself from all Israelites as belonging not to their number, but to God.

We should also include in this connection Matt. 22^{2}; cf. vv.$^{8.\ 10.\ 12}$, so far as the contents themselves are concerned, where the Messianic supper is regarded as a marriage feast for the Son of the King. But Luke 14^{16} does not contain this detail in describing the supper.[1] As even in Matthew the Son does not enter into the supper, this feature may be considered as a later addition, and need not here be taken into account.

According to the foregoing, the "Son" means for Jesus the heir to the throne of God, who as such occupies a unique position. Of course the heir to the throne after coming into possession, may well enough entrust to others the authority of government (Matt. 19^{28}, Luke $22^{29f.}$),[2] but they do not thereby become what He is. Their dignity remains ever dependent upon His. They have in a derivative sense what primarily pertains to Him alone. He receives the sovereignty because He is the Son, they because they are followers of the Son.

A different scope is given to the filial relationship of Jesus to God in Matt. 11^{27} *πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.*[3] The parallel in Luke (10^{22})

[1] See above, p. 118. [2] See above, p. 134.

[3] The Evan. Hierosol. has at the end ולמן דיצבא ברא דינלא הו גלא, "and to whom the Son wills to reveal (Him), he reveals (Him). It seems to read *ἀποκαλύψει*, and takes the last part of the verse to be an independent clause.

as given in the common text has only insignificant deviations. Blass makes Luke's reading to be: *ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός* (without *μου*)—*γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός*—*καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ* (without repetition of *οὐδεὶς γινώσκει*). In the last part of the verse Justin and Marcion read: *οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ*. The idea here entertained is not the sovereignty committed by God to Jesus, but the whole revelation of Jesus by means of which an adequate consciousness of God is attained. The "mysteries" of the sovereignty of God (see Matt. 13^{11}, Mark 4^{11}, Luke 8^{10}) in their utmost extent were entrusted by His Father to Jesus, and indeed to Him alone, with the obligation to deal with them according to His own discretion. And this exclusive committal to Him is also the most natural, because between Father and Son there exists a perfect mutual understanding so unique, that any other persons could participate in the complete knowledge of the Father only through the medium of the Son. The two clauses referring to the knowledge of the Son by the Father and of the Father by the Son must therefore be taken together, and not independently expounded. They really constitute a detailed Oriental mode of expressing the reciprocity of intimate understanding.[1] But in this case of mutual understanding, its thoroughness and absolute infallibility are assumed. He who stands in so uniquely close a relation to God is the only possible mediator of the kind, and also at the same time the absolutely reliable revealer of the whole wealth of the divine mysteries.

The phraseology will thus have been originally intended in a figurative sense. But that which holds between father and son in general is straightway applied in reference to Jesus and His heavenly Father. So that in this instance, too, the peculiar relation of Jesus to God is one that cannot be transmitted to others or be subject to change. His

[1] Cf. j. R. h. S. 58^b אלין מודי לאלין ואלין מודי לאלין, "these agree with those and those with these," *i.e.* they mutually agree.

disciples, indeed, through His means attain to the same knowledge of God that He Himself possessed. But their knowledge is derived through a medium, while His is acquired by direct intuition.

As regards the Aramaic to be presupposed here, it will be more satisfactory to change *παρεδόθη* into the active voice. It is possible, indeed, even in Palestinian Aramaic to connect the subject in question with the passive voice through מִן, but examples in support are uncommon.[1] It is further questionable whether we should use יְדַע or חֲכַם for "to know." Galilean Aramaic uses the former for "to know a fact," the latter for "to know a person."[2] The biblical Aramaic and the dialect of Onkelos use only יְדַע. The Present *γινώσκε* and the Aorist *ἔγνω* would have the same form in an unpointed text, as the participle יָדַע and the perfect יְדַע would have to be used. The transposition of Father and Son in Justin's text involves the advantage of an easier transition from the first clause of the verse to the second, but also the disadvantage that the revelation of the Son by the Son is an improbable idea. Both the Lucan *τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός* (*πατήρ*) and the shorter form in Matthew *τὸν υἱόν* (*πατέρα*), are capable of reproduction in Aramaic. See j. Ter. 48[b] לָא אֲנָא חָכֵים לְאַבָּא, "I do not know my father"; and j. Ber. 13[c] לֵית אֲנָא יָדַע מָה הוּא, "I do not know what he is." For "to be willing" biblical Aramaic has צְבָא; the Judæan dialect אֲבָא and צְבָא; the Galilean בְּעָא. But *βούληται ἀποκαλύψαι* can also be a Greek expansion of a prior *ἀποκαλύψῃ*.

Hence the Aramaic may be thus constructed: כֹּלָּא מְסַר לִי[a]

[1] See *F. E. König*, Syntax der hebr. Sprache (1897), 36 f., and the passages from Genesis he cites in Onkelos. The only other example known to me is Vay. R. 34: he regarded them "as those from whom denarii are exacted by the government" (מִתְבְּעִין מִן מַלְכוּתָא דֵּינָרִין). On the other hand, it is said, Koh. R. 7[11] הֲוָה מִתְבְּעֵי לְמַלְכוּתָא, "he was pursued by the government." In Targ. Eccl. 8[15] אִתְיְהִיב מִן שְׁמַיָּא should be rendered: "it was bestowed from heaven"; ibid. 9[2] 11[3] אִתְגְּזַר מִן שְׁמַיָּא, "it was so destined from heaven"; see p. 219 f.

[2] Cf. j. Gitt. 45[c] אִית כַּר נָשׁ דְּחָכְמִין לְחַבְרֵיהוֹן בְּאַפִּין וְלָא יָדְעִין שְׁמָהָתְהוֹן, "there are men who know others by face yet not by name."

אַבָּא וְלֵית דְּיָדַע [b]לְבַרָא אֱלָהֵן אַבָּא וְלֵית דְּיָדַע [b]לְאַבָּא אֱלָהֵן בְּרָא [c]וּמַן דִּמְגַלֵי לֵהּ בְּרָא.

(*a*) Since *πάντα* refers back to *ταῦτα* (Matt. 11[25], Luke 10[21]), כֻּלְּהוֹן, "all these things," might be better than כֻּלָּא. *ταῦτα* might perhaps be replaced by הָלֵין מִלַּיָּא, "these things" (literally these words). (*b*) Variants in Luke: מַן הוּא אַבָּא, מַן הוּא בְּרָא. (*c*) Variants in Matthew and Luke: וּמַן דְּצָבֵי בְּרָא לְגַלָּאָה לֵהּ.

So far, we have encountered nothing to show what idea Jesus entertained in regard to the genesis of His divine Sonship. It can only be said that the passages just cited appear to imply that Jesus had shown no cognisance of any beginning in this relationship. It seems to be an innate property of His personality, seeing that He, as distinct from all others, holds for His own the claim to the sovereignty of the world, and the immediate knowledge of God, just as a son by right of birth becomes an heir, and by upbringing from childhood in undivided fellowship with the father enters into that spiritual relationship with the father which is natural for the child. From the question which Jesus asked the scribes, Matt. 22[41–46] (Mark 12[35–37], Luke 20[41–44]), about the meaning of Ps. 110[1], one may, however, derive an explicit testimony on this point. The Synoptic accounts are here in virtual agreement. For it is of no real consequence that, according to Mark and Luke, Jesus should Himself propound the question, how the Messiah should be called a son of David, whereas in Matthew Jesus first causes the Pharisees to say that, from their point of view, the Messiah is a son of David. The aim in either case is the same—to awaken reflection in regard to the descent of the Messiah rather than to His dignity or exalted rank. There would indeed be nothing remarkable in the fact that a son should attain to a higher rank than his father, and for the scribes it would not in the least be strange that the Messiah should be greater than David. On that point they did not, in fact, require any instruction. Justin Martyr [1] says

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. 33, 83.

that the Jews of his time applied Ps. 110 to Hezekiah; so it appeared to them possible that David should call *this king* his Lord.[1] There is something artificial in recent attempts[2] to reduce the thought of Jesus to a mere suggestion that "son of David" was altogether unsuitable as a title for him to whom David had shown deference by calling him his Lord. An unbiassed reading of the statement of Jesus cannot avoid the conclusion that the Messiah is in reality the Son of One more exalted than David, that is, the Son of God. And in that idea there was essentially nothing extravagant. If Jesus was conscious of no beginning in His peculiar relationship to God, it must, of course, have had its genesis with His birth; and, further, God must have so participated in assigning that position, that the human factors concerned fell entirely into the background. The prophet Jeremiah, according to Jer. 1^5, prided himself in his prenatal election by God to prophecy; and Isa. 49^5 says that the servant of the Lord was formed from the womb for his appointed function. Why should Jesus, conscious of being the servant of the Lord whom Isaiah predicted, not have had a similar consciousness in regard to Himself? Only it would be natural that He, being "the Son," as distinguished from all servants, should presuppose, not merely selection and predestination, but also a creative act on the part of God, rendering Him what no one, who stands in a merely natural connection with mankind, can ever by his own efforts become. This idea is no way opposed to the other, that Jesus called Himself "Son of man." For all

[1] The Pseudepigrapha have traces of a Messianic interpretation of Ps. 110 only in the Similitudes of Enoch, in so far as it is there said that the Messiah sits upon the throne of God; see 45^3 51^3 55^4 61^8 62^2. Still, a direct dependence on Ps. 110 cannot be observed. In rabbinic literature the earliest dictum verifying this reference is that of Khamma bar Khanina (*c.* 260), Midr. Ps. 18^{36}; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Am. i. 457, see also Midr. Ps. 110^1. Later references are given in "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 7. And Jesus by no means implies that every one understood Ps. 110^1 of the Messiah; He knows, however, that His hearers, by naming any one else in place of the Messiah, would only have increased their difficulty.

[2] See, *e.g.*, *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 244.

the sublimity of which He was conscious in regard to His past, present, and future, never excludes the idea that for the present, by decree of the Divine Providence, He moves about among mankind, defenceless and weak. We do not find expressed the idea of God's becoming man, or of a twofold nature united in a single person; but there is attested the presence of One who appears in human weakness, who is a perfect Revealer of God and the future Ruler of the world, who has been bestowed upon the world by the supernatural power of God.

Nowhere do we find that Jesus called Himself the Son of God in such a sense as to suggest a merely religious and ethical relation to God,—a relation which others also actually possessed, or which they were capable of attaining or destined to acquire.

We have not taken into consideration in this connection the saying in regard to the Son's ignorance of the date of the redemption, Matt. 24[36] (Mark 13[32]), on which see p. 194. It may, however, be remarked that Zech. 14[7] and Ps. Sol. 17[23] also represent that only God knows the time of the redemption. The Targ. Eccl. 7[24] affirms that the mystery of the day when the Anointed King comes (רָז יוֹם דְּיֵיתֵי מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא) is kept secret from men. Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 260 A.D.) explained Isa. 63[4] "a day of vengeance is in my heart," with the words:[1] "in my heart I have made (it) manifest, but not to the attending angels." The command to evangelise the heathen, Matt. 28[19], is reserved for special discussion. The wording of both statements, which represents a use of the name of the Son unprecedented in the other sayings of Jesus, will be determined by the diction prevalent in the early Church.

[1] b. Sanh. 99[a]; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Am. i. 414.

5. THE SENSE ATTACHED BY THE SYNOPTISTS TO THE TITLE "SON OF GOD."

If the Hellenistic Synoptists took the title "Son of man" to mean "one born of man," they will also have regarded *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* as "one born of God." The Greek, unlike the Hebrew, does not use the term "son" to denote an extensive circle of relationships. He will always be inclined to understand *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* in the most exact literal sense, whereas the Israelite would only accept this idea through the constraint of some special reason. As regards Matthew, reference may be made to 16^{16}, where *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος* points back to *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in v.[13]; further, to 26^{63}, cf. v.[64], where *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* are likewise contrasted; but specially to the narrative of the birth of Jesus, which, even without explicit reference thereto, forms the commentary to the testimony of the divine voice at the Baptism (3^{17}). As regards Luke, the words of the angel, 1^{35}, explain for the readers the meaning of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* by express reference to the unique nature of the birth of Jesus. Even the human lineage of Jesus is traced back by Luke (3^{38}) to God, so that from any point of view Jesus comes to the position of "Son of God." Even before the Baptism Jesus calls God His "Father," Luke 2^{49}, where *τοῦ πατρός μου* appears contrasted with *ὁ πατήρ σου*, v.[48], in the language of the mother of Jesus. In Luke $22^{69.\ 70}$ Son of God is contrasted with Son of man. As Mark[1] gives no history of the birth, but in its place at the beginning of his Gospel narrates the spiritual endowment of Jesus, the latter will accordingly represent for him[2] the "generation" of the Son. In his account of the condemnation of Jesus, $14^{61.\ 62}$, he, too, has put

[1] The ancient reading *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* appended to *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Mark 1^{1}, cannot be reckoned original.

[2] This will not apply to Matthew and Luke. *W. Lütgert*, Das Reich Gottes, 69, wrongly says of the Synoptists in general, that in the history of the Baptism they "narrate the act of God, through which He adopted Jesus."

in antithesis the "Son of the Blessed" and the "Son of man."

The Hellenistic explanation of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ cannot, in view of the ideas expressed by Jesus Himself, be pronounced altogether unjustified. An essential difference in apprehending the idea appears, however, in so far as Jesus uses the expression with respect primarily to His present relation to God, and only gives a glimpse that His origin was also of a nature corresponding to this position; whereas, on the other hand, the Synoptists make the latter consideration the foundation of the expression. The mode of thought in their case is Greek; that of Jesus is Semitic.

XI. CHRIST.

1. THE TERM IN JEWISH USAGE.

(*a*) *Derivation and Form.*

If the anointed of the Lord, mentioned in Ps. 2^2, be taken as a personification of Israel,[1] there is then no Old Testament passage in which the coming Prince of Salvation was called in a historical sense "the Anointed." This, however, should be considered accidental; for there was nothing to hinder Isaiah, *e.g.*, from calling the promised King "the Anointed of the Lord."

The oldest witness for the Messianic interpretation of Ps. 2 is the Psalter of Solomon (17); see above, p. 270. There, too, we find ($v.^{36}$; cf. $18^{6.8}$) the earliest designation of the Prince of Salvation as "the Anointed of the Lord," which will accordingly have Ps. 2 as its source. It is quite likely that other Scripture passages regarded as applying to the King of salvation contributed to the formation of the title. Mention is made of help, which is the allotted portion of

[1] Cf. p. 268, and *H. Weinel*, משח and its derivatives, ZAW, xviii. (1898), 69 ff.

"Jhvh's Anointed," Ps. 18[51] 20[7] 28[8];[1] cf. 1 Sam. 2[10], 2 Sam. 22[51], Hab. 3[13]. Still there are no adequate proofs of any ancient Messianic exposition of these passages. The words of 1 Sam. 2[10] וְיָרֵם קֶרֶן מְשִׁיחוֹ, "and He shall exalt the horn of His anointed," taken in connection with Ps. 89[25] וּבִשְׁמִי תָּרוּם קַרְנוֹ, "and in my name shall his horn be exalted," are recalled by the Messianic petition in the Babylonian Eighteen Benedictions[2] (or Shemoneh Esreh). The first half of this petition is based on Jer. 33[15], and the other on Ezek. 29[21], the words being: אֶת צֶמַח דָּוִד עַבְדְּךָ בִּמְהֵרָה תַצְמִיחַ וְקַרְנוֹ תָרוּם בִּישׁוּעָתֶךָ כִּי לִישׁוּעָתְךָ קִוִּינוּ כָּל הַיּוֹם בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה' מַצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן יְשׁוּעָה, "let the Branch of David thy servant sprout forth speedily, and let his horn be exalted through thy help: Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest to bud forth an horn of salvation!" In this connection we have also in the prayer beginning אָבִינוּ מַלְכֵּנוּ[3] the petition: תָּרֵם קֶרֶן מְשִׁיחֶךָ, "raise up the horn of Thine anointed," which, however, does not appear in Seder Rab Amram, i. 45[b]. On the other hand, Ps. 132[17] שָׁם אַצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן לְדָוִד עָרַכְתִּי נֵר לִמְשִׁיחִי, "there will I make the horn of David to bud: I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed," is made use of in the prayer הַבִּינֵנוּ, which is an ancient abridged form of the Eighteen Benedictions.[4] Its words are: יִשְׂמְחוּ כָּל חוֹסֵי בָךְ בְּבִנְיַן עִירֶךָ וּבְחַדּוּשׁ בֵּית מִקְדָּשֶׁךָ וּבְהַצְמָחַת קֶרֶן לְדָוִד עַבְדֶּךָ וּבַעֲרִיכַת נֵר לְבֶן יִשַׁי מְשִׁיחֶךָ

[1] For Ps. 21, in particular, Messianic exposition can be proved; see for v.[4] Midr. Teh.; Tanch., ed. Buber, Shem. 11[b]; Shem. R. 8; Bern. R. 14 (according to Bem. R. Abin, and Midr. Teh. Simon); for v.[5] b. Sukk. 52[a] (Baraitha). For Mess. exposition of Ps. 89[28], see Shem. R. 19 (Nathan, *c.* 180 A.D.); Midr. Teh. 5[1]; Yalk. Shim. ii. 840 (Shemuel bar Nachmani, *c.* 260). On Ps. 110, see above, p. 285 f.

[2] In Palestine, as it seems, this petition formed part of that concerning the building of Jerusalem, which, in Babylon, had a separate position; cf. j. Ber. 5[a], Tos. Ber. iii. 25 with b. Taan. 13[b]; see *S. Baer*, Seder Abodath Yisrael, 97; *L. Landshuth*, Siddur hegyon leb, 65 ff. On the other hand, *Rothschild*, Der Synagogal-Cultus in hist. krit. Entwickelung, i. (1870) 62 f., erroneously maintains that in Palestine the Messianic petition had for long ceased to be used. See, however, "Messianische Texte," No. 6[a].

[3] *Baer*, Seder Abodath Yisrael, 111.

[4] See "Messianische Texte," No. 7; cf. *Baer*, Seder Abodath Yisrael, 108; Seder Rab Amram, i. 54[a].

"may all they who trust in Thee rejoice over the building of thy city and the renewal of Thy sanctuary, over the budding forth of an horn for David Thy servant, and the ordaining of a lamp for the son of Jesse Thine anointed!" Elsewhere, see on Ps. 132^{17}, Ech. R. 2^{6} (Midr. Ps. 75^{11}); Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Shem. 46^{a} (Yalk. Shim. i. 363) 50^{a} (Yalk. Shim. i. 378); Vay. R. 31 (Yalk. Shim. i. 650); Yelammedenu, Yalk. Shim. i. 47 (Simeon ben Lakish, *c.* 260);[1] v.[18], Pirke Eliezer 28 (Yalk. Shim. i. 76); Pes. Rabb. 159^{b}.

The fact is, that no single passage, on the ground of Messianic interpretation, can be made responsible for the title "Messiah." When a name was wanted for the King of salvation, as depicted especially in Isa. 11^{1-5},[2] there was a title which at once recommended itself—the solemn synonym often used for the royal title, and indicating the King's relation to God; and it was all the more convenient because the divine appointment and recognition formed the vital element in the case of the expected King. Of him, therefore, it would become usual to speak as מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה, Aram. מְשִׁיחָא דַיְיָ, "Jhvh's Anointed." But as the Tetragrammaton was not pronounced, and as there was a reluctance[3] to name "God," so here, as in other commonly used titles, the name of God was omitted, and only הַמָּשִׁיחַ, Aram. מְשִׁיחָא, "the Anointed," was said. The Aramaic form is the basis of the Greek transliteration which appears in John 1^{42} 4^{25}. The peculiar form *Μεσσίας* with its doubled sibilant, I have formerly[4] sought to explain through a phonetic variation in Semitic. It seems preferable to point out that in Greek *μέσσος* is found in use alongside of *μέσος*. A similar relation will hold between *Μεσσίας* and *Μεσίας*, which is intrinsically more accurate, though rarely found.

[1] Cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Am. i. 403.

[2] In the Book of Enoch, Psalter of Solomon, Apocalypse of Baruch, and 2 Esdras, the passage Isa. 11^{1-5} is one of the most important bases of their Messianic doctrine.

[3] See above, p. 194 ff.

[4] Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 124, Note 3; cf. 261, Note 1.

The full name "Anointed of Jhvh," or "my, his anointed," is first attested, Ps. Sol. 17^{36} $18^{6.8}$, Bar. Apoc. 39^{7} 40^{1} 72^{2}.[1] The abbreviated form—apart from the New Testament—is found first in 2 Esdr. $7^{28f.}$ 12^{32}. This was the form which became usual in the mouth of the common people.

Later Jewish literature has the full name only in the Targums wherever the text gives occasion for it, and in the Liturgy. מְשִׁיחָא דַיְיָ occurs Targ. Isa. 4^{2} 28^{5}; מְשִׁיחָךְ, Targ. Hab. 3^{18}, Ps. 18^{32} 84^{40}; מְשִׁיחֵיהּ, Targ. Zech. 4^{7} 10^{4}, Ps. 2^{2} 20^{7}. The prayer beginning מַלְכֵּנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ [2] contains the form קָרֵב מְשִׁיחֶךָ, "let Thine anointed draw near." With regard to the shortened form, it has been pointed out by Franz Delitzsch,[3] with a view to explaining the occasional use of *Χριστός* [4] without the article, that the Rabbis also sometimes use מָשִׁיחַ without the article in the manner of a proper name. This, indeed, is the usual practice in the Babylonian Talmud when מָשִׁיחַ is not subordinated by the syntax to any other word. מָשִׁיחַ, without accompaniment, occurs Sukk. 52^{b}; Sanh. 93^{b}, 96^{b}, 97^{a}, 98^{a} 99^{a}; even in Aramaic מְשִׁיחַ, Erub. 43^{b}; Yoma 19^{b}; Bab. mez. 85^{b}; Ab. z. 2^{b}; Sanh. 93^{b}, 96^{b}, 98^{a}, 99^{a}; so that we have even שְׁנֵי מְשִׁיחַ, "the years of Messiah," b. Sanh. 98^{b}, and חֲבָלָיו דְּמְשִׁיחַ, "the sorrow of Messiah," b. Keth. 111^{a}. It is also said: מָשִׁיחַ בֶּן דָּוִד, "Messiah son of David," b. Sukk. 52^{a}; Aram. מְשִׁיחַ בַּר דָּוִד, Targ. Cant. 4^{5} 7^{4}. Again it is מְשִׁיחָא which is written, b. Erub. 43^{b}; Sanh. 51^{b}; Chull. 63^{a}; and הַמָּשִׁיחַ, Nidd. 13^{b}. The phrase יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "the days of the Messiah," always involves the article; see b. Sanh. 97^{a}, 99^{a}; cf. Ber. i. 8; j. Kil. 32^{c}. Probably we should also read חֲבָלוֹ שֶׁלַּמָּשִׁיחַ,[5]

[1] Cf. above, p. 270.

[2] Seder Rab Amram, i. 9^{a}.

[3] Theol. Litbl. 1889, No. 45.

[4] *Χριστός* with no article occurs in the Synoptists in *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, Matt. $1^{1.18}$, Mark 1^{1}; and arising from this designation in *Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*, Matt. 1^{16} $27^{17.22}$; also in *Χριστὸς κύριος*, Luke 2^{11}, besides Mark 9^{41}, Luke 23^{2}. Otherwise uniformly *ὁ Χριστός*.

[5] The plural חֲבָלֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ, brought into notice particularly by *Wünsche*, is quite unknown in the ancient literature, as I have shown in "Der leid. u. der sterb. Messias," 42.

"the sorrow of the Messiah," b. Sanh. 98b; b. Sabb. 118a; cf. Mechilta, ed. Fr. 50b, 51a; שְׁמוֹ שֶׁלַּמָּשִׁיחַ, "the name of the Messiah," b. Pes. 5a; cf. Ber. R. 1; רוּחוֹ שֶׁלַּמָּשִׁיחַ, "the spirit of the Messiah," Ber. R. 2; דּוֹרוֹ שֶׁלַּמָּשִׁיחַ, "the generation of the Messiah," Mechilta, ed. Fr. 56b. Nevertheless, the Babylonian custom of using מָשִׁיחַ as a proper name is incapable of being verified in regard to Palestine. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as old, or as having had a determining influence on Christian phraseology.

The older Targums have always the definite form מְשִׁיחָא; see Onk. Gen. 49[10], Num. 24[17]; Targ. 1 Sam. 2[10], 2 Sam. 23[3], 1 Kings 4[43], Isa. 9[6] 10[27] 11[1. 6] 14[29], Jer. 33[13], Mic. 5[2], Zech. 6[12]. For מְשִׁיחָא דַּיי, see above. עַבְדִּי מְשִׁיחָא, "my servant, the anointed," occurs Targ. Isa. 42[1] 43[10] 52[13], Zech. 3[8]; מְשִׁיחָא דְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, "the anointed of Israel," Targ. Isa. 16[1. 5], Mic. 4[8]; מְשִׁיחֵהוֹן, "their anointed," Targ. Isa. 53[10], Jer. 30[21], Hos. 14[8]; מְשִׁיחָא בַּר דָּוִד, "the anointed son of David," Hos. 3[5]; מָשִׁיחַ דְּצִדְקָא, "the anointed of righteousness," Jer. 23[5] 33[15] (ed. Venice, 1517; but ed. Venice, 1525, מְשִׁיחַ דְּצִדְקִיָּא). For מְשִׁיחָא alone, see also Sot. ix. 15; j. Kil. 32b. In the younger Targums, as also in the Palestinian Midrash and Talmud, the fuller title, מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא, Hebr. מֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ,[1] predominates. This should not, as is generally the case, be translated by "the King Messiah," because מְשִׁיחָא and הַמָּשִׁיחַ are clearly not meant as proper names. In later Jewish Aramaic, a title is regularly placed after the proper name.[2] We have יַנַּי מַלְכָּא, "the king Yannai," Ber. R. 91 לוּלְיָנוֹס מַלְכָּא, "the king Julian," j. Ned. 37d; שְׁלֹמֹה מַלְכָּא, "the king Solomon"; דָּוִד מְשִׁיחָא, "David the anointed," in the Litany[3] רַחֲמָנָא אִדְּכַר; יוּדָן נְשִׂיאָ, "the Prince Judan," j. Taan. 65a. "King Messiah" would have to be

[1] הַמֶּלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ is unusual; see Seder Rab Amram, i. 53a. On the omission of the article with definite substantives, see *F. E. König*, Syntax d. hebr. Sprache, 403 f.; *S. R. Driver*, Hebrew Tenses,[3] 281 ff.

[2] Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic admit the inverted order; see *König*, op. cit. 397 f.; *E. Kautzsch*, Gramm. d. bibl. Aram. 149 f.

[3] Seder Rab Amram, ii. 19b f.

expressed by מְשִׁיחַ מַלְכָּא, whereas מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא means "the king, the anointed," or "the anointed king." Examples for the Aramaic form are found j. Ber. 5[a], j. Taan. 68[d]; and for the Hebrew form, Ber. R. 1, 98, Shem. R. 1. For מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא, see also Targ. Jerus. I. Gen. 3[15] 35[21] 49[1. 10. 17], Ex. 40[9], Num. 23[21] 24[20. 24], Deut. 25[19] 30[4]; Targ. Jerus. II. Gen. 3[15] 49[10. 11. 12], Ex. 12[42], Num. 11[26] 24[7], Targ. Cant. 1[8] 7[14] 8[1. 2. 4], Ruth 1[1] 3[15], Eccl. 1[11] 7[24], Ps. 21[2. 8] 45[3] 61[7. 9] 72[1] 80[16]. מְשִׁיחָא stands by itself in this sense only in Targ. Jerus. I. Num. 24[17], Targ. Lam. 2[22] 4[22]; and for מְשִׁיחַ בַּר דָּוִד, as well as מְשִׁיחֵהּ, מְשִׁיחֵיהּ, see the two preceding pages.

A less common title, in which מְשִׁיחַ is similarly inadmissible as a proper name, is מְשִׁיחַ צִדְקֵנוּ, "our righteous anointed." By this name the people Israel refer to the Messiah, Pes. Rabb. 162[b], 163[a], 164[a]. In a similar manner God calls Him "My righteous Anointed," מְשִׁיחַ צִדְקִי, ibid. 161[b], 162[a], 163[a].[1] Men addressing God in prayer say: מְשִׁיחַ צִדְקָךְ, "Thy righteous Anointed," Seder Rab Amram, i. 9[a]. The same name is given to David, ibid. 10[b], and, apparently, also to Israel, ibid. 12[a]. The designation is borrowed from צֶמַח צַדִּיק, Jer. 33[15], where the Targum has מְשִׁיחַ דִּצְדְקָא, and perhaps also from the Messianic name יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ, "our righteous Lord," Jer. 23[6]. There is also found מְשִׁיחַ הַצַּדִּיק, "the righteous Anointed," Agada to Shir ha-Shirim 4[11].[2]

(*b*) *Signification and Content of the Title "Christ."*

The name מְשִׁיחָא is one of those for which the particular term selected is of minor consequence compared to the general conception entertained in regard to the individual so designated. It is this general conception which really gives the word its full significance. Still, the literal sense of the expression cannot be neglected. The kings of Israel from the beginning were called "anointed of Jehovah," not merely to

[1] Cf. "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Mess." 58 f.

[2] Jew. Quart. Rev. vii. 153; cf. Yalk. Machiri (ed. Spira, 1894) on Isa. 11[12].

suggest that at their installation there had been an unction with holy oil, but to imply that in virtue of this unction they belonged to a special circle of the servants of God, their persons being sacred and inviolable. Whoever offers violence to this anointed character, commits an outrage against God. Hence cursing of God and of the king stand together, 1 Kings $21^{10.\ 13}$. The character acquired through this unction is so prominently present in the thought of a Hebrew, that he can use the expression even where no actual unction had taken place. Thus Cyrus, Isa. 45^{1}, and the Patriarchs, Ps. 105^{15}, are spoken of as "God's anointed ones," as being under His inviolable protection. When the king of the Messianic age is called מְשִׁיחָא, that implies that he is under God's peculiar protection; and it should be noted that at the time the Jews coined this expression, they had no God-protected sovereign at their head. To set their hopes upon him meant the expectation of an independent kingdom protected by God. *This* is the Jewish Messianic idea, which one should beware of pronouncing "carnal"; because, thus apprehended, the idea corresponds, on the whole, with Old Testament prophecy. In the sense meant by Jesus, such a predicate is possible only when any one, trusting to flesh as his arm, pledges himself to set in operation at his own instance processes which originate with God alone.

It must be specially observed that the "Messiah" of Old Testament prophecy was never at any time regarded as "Redeemer." In the Old Testament it is God who is for Israel גּוֹאֵל "redeemer," פֹּדֶה "liberator," מוֹשִׁיעַ "Saviour," מַצִּיל "deliverer," and never the Messiah; and no similar agency is ever ascribed to the latter. Failure to observe this has led to many distorted pronouncements on the statements and the silence of the prophetic and apocalyptic writers in regard to the Messiah. So long ago as 1874, D. Castelli had written these weighty sentences:[1] "In no part of the Old Testament does the Messiah appear as himself the agent of

[1] Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei, 164.

redemption in virtue of his own proper power. The real redeemer is God.—The Messiah is the new king of the redeemed people." For the earlier Isaiah the Messiah was a highly important personality, because his righteous government guaranteed the abiding welfare of the redeemed Israel. As Jeremiah and Ezekiel recognised a miraculous transformation in the heart of the people of the future, the activity of a king could seem to them of no great consequence. They have therefore little to say of the Messiah. It need not be supposed that such prophets and apocalyptic writers as never mention the Messiah at all, should therefore have believed that Israel should be kingless in the age of salvation. But they considered it superfluous to speak of the king, the vital consideration being first of all the advent of redemption. There is silence on the subject of the Messianic king in Sibyll. iii. 73 f., Enoch i. (1–36) and v. (91–104), the Slavonic Enoch, Ass. Mosis, Book of Jubilees,[1] certain sections of the Apocalypse of Baruch and of 2 Esdras, also in Judith, Tobit, Sirach, and even in the primary form [2] of the Kaddish. Other books mention the Messiah, but give the impression that no definite apprehension existed as to his nature. It was sufficient to recognise that there is a Messiah. As a matter of course, his character and government are appropriate to the age of salvation. A passive part of this kind is ascribed to the Messiah in Enoch iv. (83–90), in the passage Bar. Apoc. 29^3 30^1, which is probably foreign to its present connection, and in 2 Esdras $7^{28f.}$ It is not otherwise, even in the official prayer of the synagogue, the Eighteen Supplications, which represents God as gathering together the scattered people, undoing the sovereignty of arrogance, building Jerusalem, making His habitation there once more, restoring the temple

[1] How *W. Singer*, Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Leptogenesis, i. (1898), can discover in this book, with its absence of Messianic elements, a polemical document of the Jewish Christians against St. Paul, is incomprehensible.

[2] See "Messianische Texte," No. 8.

service; whereas the Messiah[1] is mentioned only at the close, apparently because the divine promise given to David cannot remain unfulfilled. God alone, according to the seventh petition, is Israel's Redeemer (גּוֹאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל).

On the other hand, the work of redemption is assigned to the Messiah in Sibyll. iii. 652 ff., which says that the king sent by God destroys the perverse, and unites himself with the obedient, and in the Similitudes of Enoch, where the Son of man judges and overthrows the secular rulers; and similarly in Apoc. Bar. 39^{7} $40^{1ff.}$ 70^{9} 72^{2-6}, 2 Esdr. $12^{32ff.}$ $13^{9-11.\ 37.\ 38}$. Thus there had arisen among the Jewish people in the time of Jesus a tendency, diverging from the older prophecy based on the Messianic picture of Isa. 11^{1-5}, which concerned itself with a Messiah endowed with miraculous power, who was to overthrow the secular might, and by this means to liberate the people of God. Thenceforward it became possible to transfer to the Messiah statements which the Old Testament applies to God only as the Redeemer of Israel. An interesting example of this kind in the New Testament is seen in Matt. 2^{21}, where the name of Jesus is explained by the words, *αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.* But it is of God that Ps. 130^{8} says: הוּא יִפְדֶּה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל מִכֹּל עֲוֹנוֹתָיו, "and He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities."

As the earlier view still persisted, there was therefore at the time in question a twofold conception of the Messiah; one, more closely attached to ancient prophecy, which regarded the Messiah merely as the Prince of the redeemed people; the other, recently developed, which took the Messiah himself to be the redeemer. In neither case was he merely a political character. Jews with purely secular interests would hardly have concerned themselves, in that age any more than now, with the Messianic hopes. But the Israelite who rested his

[1] The Davidic sovereignty alone is mentioned in the Palestinian recension of the Eighteen Benedictions ("Mess. Texte," No. 6^{a}), in Habinenu (ibid. No. 7), in the Additional Prayer for New Year (ibid. No. 9), and in the Blessing at Meals.

hopes upon the divine promise to Israel felt it to be a religious necessity that God should vindicate His power against the tyrannous empires of the world, and so give to His people the position befitting them as His. And beyond this Israel also required a purification from godless elements within itself. This latter point must be emphasised against Ehrhardt's [1] strange contention, that in the view of the Apocalytic writers "the people would be justified through the observation of the law, and they looked for no other justification; all they wanted was the possession of power, outward triumph." [2] But the idea of a separation between the righteous and the wicked, which had to be carried out in Israel, does pervade the apocalyptic writings. The moral admonitions in the son of Sirach, in the Psalter of Solomon, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in Enoch 94–105, cannot be pronounced lacking in deep earnestness and holy zeal.[3] Any excessive insistence on the ceremonial precepts of the law cannot be observed in these books. It must be admitted, however, that in this respect the Books of Tobit, Judith, and Jubilees occupy a considerably lower position. For that reason, naturally, the Messiah does not appear as a person

[1] *E. Ehrhardt*, Der Grundcharakter der Ethik Jesu (1895), 27.

[2] Ehrhardt's reference to b. Ber. 34[b] is misleading. The passage, true enough, gives as the opinion of the Babylonian Samuel (*c.* 250 A.D.): "The difference between the present age and the days of the Messiah consists only in the oppression through the secular powers." But this means merely that in the time of Messiah no transformation of nature will as yet have taken place, because such transformation does not occur till the end of the world. In this connection it is asserted that *all* prophetic promises are valid only for the *penitent*. And it is often enough maintained that the redemption is postponed because Israel is *not* in the right condition required by the law.

[3] The inexact notions entertained about the ethics of late Judaism are illustrated in *Ehrhardt*, op. cit. 45, who infers from the preference assigned to גְּמִילוּת חֲסָדִים over צְדָקָה, b. Sukk. 49[b], that a distinction was made between "a more formal exercise of virtue, and one directed rather to practical results." He has rightly identified צְדָקָה with "almsgiving," but has not perceived that גְּמִילוּת חֲסָדִים denotes above all things visits to the sick, attendance at funerals, and consolation of mourners. "Moral acts involving reward" (fruchtbringend) were never thought of in this context. Moral conduct is determined for Judaism by the Law; the "practice of deeds of love" exceeds what is prescribed by Law.

UNIVER OF CALIFOR

who strikes the dominant note in the religion. His function does not consist in being a moral example, in teaching right conduct, or in being mediator of atonement, far less in being the giver of the divine Spirit; but just in ruling over Israel as a king according to the will of God. But this also applies to the Prince of salvation as he appears in Old Testament prophecy. It was a later period that regarded the Messiah as expounder of the existing law, or even the inaugurator of a new law. Expiatory sufferings were then attributed to him, which, however, are brought into organic relation with the process of salvation only by the appendix to Pesikta Rabbati. On the other hand, the doctrine, which arose in the second century, of a Messiah ben Joseph who should suffer death, has no connection with the remission of sin. See "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 1–26.

(*c*) *The Idea of Pre-existence.*

We may recall the Jewish ideas already reviewed, p. 129 ff., which are concerned with the pre-existence of various entities, and especially of the Messiah. Harnack[1] supposes it to be an ancient Jewish conception that "everything of genuine value, which successively appears upon earth, has its existence in heaven, *i.e.* it exists with God, meaning in the cognition of God, and therefore really." But this idea must be pronounced thoroughly un-Jewish, at all events un-Palestinian, although the medieval Kabbala certainly harbours notions of this sort. According to Ex. $25^{9.40}$ 26^{30} 27^{8}, Num. 8^{4}, there was shown to Moses on Sinai a model of the tabernacle and its furniture. No ulterior idea is implied beyond the thought that the oral instruction given to Moses, being insufficient to guide him with precision, was supplemented by the exhibition of models. By this means the object was secured that the structure fully conformed to

[1] Dogmengeschichte,[3] i. 755; see also *Baldensperger*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 89; *Schürer*, Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes, ii. 423, 446.

the divine intention. This case is substantially the same as that in 1 Chron. $28^{11ff.}$, where David, appealing to a divine mandate concerning it, hands over to Solomon a model of the temple that was to be built. A house of God is not to be constructed to please human fancies, but according to exact divine prescription. A sanctuary permanently existent in heaven, of which tabernacle and temple were imperfect imitations, is never contemplated.

When one finds occasional statements about constituents so important in the scheme of the world as the Law, the Temple, Paradise, Hell, affirming a premundane existence in their case, these are to be regarded neither as a "warrant of compensation against the damages which the possessions of religion might incur in the bitter struggle against the hostile elements";[1] nor yet as bound up with the thought of the divine Omniscience "which preordains history and is never taken unawares by events."[2] Any one familiar with the discussions on these topics in the Midrash is aware that behind these utterances there lies no more than a vague notion that the most important elements for realising the world's chief end must have been provided from the first. The actual production of these things at once would be better calculated to secure the end than a mere designing of them. The Jerusalem of the consummation may fitly be said to come from heaven, being so majestically conceived that it can never be the product of human effort. The city of golden streets must, of course, have been made by God. On some occasions we have to do merely with a rabbinical combination of scriptural texts. Gen. 1^3 speaks of a "light" which thenceforward seems to have no place in the world. And when, for instance, Isa. 9^1 60^1, Zech. 14^7 mention the appearance of a light in the Messianic age, it is said that this must be the light of Gen. 1^3 which was being kept in

[1] Thus *Baldensperger*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu,[2] 89.
[2] *Harnack*, op. cit.

store for the pious, Ber. R. 3, 11; Pes. Rabb. 118a, 161a. b.[1] The presupposition implied is that all the primordial excellence of creation must again be restored at the end. A case of the same nature is found in the grape-juice of Paradise and the primæval monsters Leviathan and Behemoth. Paradise lost returns, bringing such things with it.

As for the Messiah, two ways of regarding him were possible. On the one hand, he might be looked upon as indispensable in the scheme of the world, so that it could be said that God had not only, long ages ago, contemplated the provision of a Messiah, but had actually created him. On the other hand, it was also possible to assume from the wonderful manner of his advent, that he was not an ordinary child of earth. As a matter of fact, the earlier rabbinism was content with holding, on the basis of Ps. 72[17],[2] the pre-existence of the name only of the Messiah.[3] Since the Messiah had to appear as a fully-developed man, the opinion generally was that until his manifestation he should remain unknown upon earth.[4] Before his appearance he had then to undergo some sudden metamorphosis.[5] Others supposed that he should be translated into Paradise, and should thence make his advent.[6] This was all the more likely if he were regarded as a return to earth of David[7] or Hezekiah.[8] The celestial pre-existence of Messiah, as stated in the Simili-

[1] Cf. "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 58. [2] Ibid. 72.

[3] The Targums do not go beyond the name; see Targ. Mic. 5[1], Zech. 4[7], Ps. 72[17]. *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theologie, i. 75, finds personal pre-existence attested in Targ. Isa. 9[6], Mic. 5[2] (read 5[1]), and ideal pre-existence in Targ. Ps. 93[1], Prov. 8[8]. But the last two passages hardly deal with the Messiah at all; the second cited attributes pre-existence only to the name; and the first passage speaks only of an endless duration of the Messianic rule. Holtzmann's statements probably originate from *A. Edersheim*, who in "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," [2] i. 175, gives prominence to assertions that are inaccurate. More precise information is found in *Weber*, Jüdische Theologie,[2] 354 ff.

[4] See John 7[27]; Justin, Dial. c. Trypho, viii. 110; Targ. Mic. 4[8]; j. Ber. 5[a]; also "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 39 ff., 73.

[5] See above, p. 178. [6] "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 77 ff.

[7] So j. Ber. 5[a] (Baraitha); cf. "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 73.

[8] So b. Ber. 28[b] (Yokhanan ben Zakkai, *c.* 80 A.D.).

tudes of Enoch and in 2 [4] Esdr. 13, 14, excluding [1]—so at least it seems—an earthly origin, implies, apart from the incentive contributed by Dan. 7^{13}, his miraculous superhuman appearance. According to the late addition to Pesikta Rabbati, the Messiah shares his pre-existence with the souls of all men. The only difference is that he appears to exist not merely as a soul, but as a complete personality.[2] For all these ideas of pre-existence, earthly and heavenly, a potent stimulus lay in the cherished hope that the redemption was imminent, or might, at any rate, come at any moment. In that case, of course, the Messiah was already in existence; the only question was, where? The divine providence comes here into consideration, because it is due to it that all things have been so well ordered that the divine scheme of the world should realise itself without impediment.

The notion of pre-existence is entirely absent in Ber. R. 2,[3] which says that the Spirit of God, brooding over Chaos in Gen. 1^2, was "the Spirit of the Messiah." This belongs to an exposition of Simeon ben Lakish (*c.* 260), which applies Gen. 1^2 to the "sovereignties," מַלְכֻיּוֹת, of the world. The word תֹּהוּ is applied by him to Babylon; בֹּהוּ, to the Medes; חֹשֶׁךְ, to the Greek dominion; תְּהוֹם, the godless sovereignty (Rome); רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, the Messiah;[4] הַמַּיִם, repentance, failing which the Messiah does not come. Edersheim [5] holds that the idea of the co-operation of the Messiah in the work of creation is

[1] The coming of the Messiah from the sea, 2 Esdr. 13^1, implies, according to 13^{52}, only his complete invisibility so far as the inhabitants of the earth are concerned. He seems from 14^9 to have stayed in Paradise.

[2] See "Der leid. u. d. sterb. Messias," 58. In Pes. Rabb. 152b it is said: "At the beginning of the creation of the world the Anointed King was 'born' (נוֹלַד), whose inception in the thought (of God) took place before the world was made."

[3] See Ber. R. 8, Vay. R. 14, for the same phrase; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. pal. Amor. i. 389 f. Only Pes. Rabb. 152b has construed from it an assertion of the pre-existence of the Messiah.

[4] The "Spirit of the Messiah" is only referred to, because Isa. 11^2 was the instrument used for bringing the Messiah into connection with "the Spirit" of Gen. 1^2.

[5] The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah,[2] i. 178.

here indicated, or at least of a function of the Messiah in regard to the whole world, such as raised him beyond the status of men. But both inferences appear absurd when it is remembered that a corresponding pre-existence would have to be maintained for the four secular kingdoms. Ben Lakish had nothing of the kind in view, but simply found it remarkable that the words of Gen. 1^{2} should contain such suggestions of the future history of the world.

2. THE APPLICATION OF THE NAME "MESSIAH" TO JESUS.

In Matt. $27^{17.22}$ Pilate uses the expression *Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*. That is not intended to mean "Jesus who is supposed to be the Messiah," but with the usual sense of this idiom "Jesus surnamed Christ." The same form is seen Matt. 1^{16}, and in *Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος*, 4^{18} 10^{2}. In this case we have presumably the language of the Church, which named its heavenly head not "Jesus" merely, but either *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, as in Matt. $1^{1.18}$, Mark 1^{1}, or else by the surname[1] *ὁ Χριστός*, as in Matt. 11^{2}. It cannot, however, be supposed that during His earthly life Jesus ever bore the title "Messiah" as a surname. According to Matt. 16^{20} (Mark 8^{30}, Luke 9^{21}), His disciples were not allowed so to speak of Him, and other persons will hardly have made use of such a surname. The more precise form of Pilate's words will be as in Mark $15^{9.12}$, where the judge is represented—obviously in reference to the indictment brought against Jesus and His own averment — as calling Jesus ironically the "King of the Jews."

Still less can it be supposed that the form *Χριστὸς κύριος* was anywhere a common title of the Messiah. This is found, indeed, LXX Lam. 4^{20}, Ps. Sol. 17^{36}, but is no mere mistranslation of the Hebr. מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה. For it is incredible

[1] On "by-names" (Kinnui) and their frequent displacement of the individual name, see my treatise "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 53 f.

that a translator should have taken יהוה to be a Messianic name by mistake. It is more reasonable to hold that the Greek *Χριστὸς κυρίου* was changed into *Χριστὸς κύριος*. In Luke 2^{11} *Χριστὸς κύριος* cannot possibly arise from a Hebrew original.[1] It must be due to Luke himself, who here uses the appellation *Χριστός* for the first time in his writings, and required to explain the new term for his reader, in the same way as the Jews do for Pilate by saying, 23^{2}, *Χριστὸς βασιλεύς*. In Acts 2^{36} Luke also puts *κύριος* alongside of *Χριστός*, and frequently in the Gospel calls Jesus simply *ὁ κύριος*.

The expression *ὁ Χριστὸς κυρίου* is indeed biblical, and is well suited to the revelation given to Simeon by the Holy Spirit (Luke 2^{26}); but in the Petrine confession, where Luke uses it in the form *ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (9^{20}), it would be out of conformity with the common parlance of the people.[2] The simple *ὁ Χριστός* of Mark 8^{29} is alone free from objection. It was this term that Jesus Himself used in speaking of the Messiah, Matt. 22^{42} (Mark 12^{35}, Luke 20^{41}).

By contemporaries Jesus was frequently called *ὁ Χριστός*. One instance is by Peter, Matt. 16^{16} (Mark 8^{29}, Luke 9^{20}). On this occasion, *ὁ Χριστός*, Aram. מְשִׁיחָא, given by Mark, is historically more exact; and the additions in Luke (*τοῦ θεοῦ*) and in Matthew (*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*) should be discarded, as has already been demonstrated p. 274, cf. 196. And if the words *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* of the demoniacs, Matt. 8^{29} (Mark 5^{7}, Luke 8^{28}), Mark 3^{11}, Luke 4^{41}, are to be traced back to *ὁ Χριστός*, as indicated on p. 275, this would also imply a designation of Jesus by this title. According to Matt. 27^{54} (Mark 15^{39}), the Roman centurion on guard at the Cross acknowledged Jesus to be *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, *i.e.* "Messiah," but the words are otherwise given in Luke 23^{47}. Jesus is called derisively (*ὁ*) *Χριστός*, Matt. 26^{68}, Mark 15^{32} (Luke

[1] See above, pp. 38 f., 224.

[2] See above, p. 291 f.

23^{35}), Luke 23^{39}. In Matt. $27^{40.\,43}$ *υἱὸς θεοῦ* likewise depends on the derisive use of *ὁ Χριστός*.

Jesus is indirectly referred to as Messiah where He is regarded as the future possessor of the kingdom, Matt. 20^{21} (Mark 10^{37}), Luke 23^{42}. He is mockingly called "King" Matt. 27^{11} (Mark 15^{2}, Luke 23^{3}), Mark $15^{9.\,12}$, Matt. 27^{29} (Mark 15^{18}), Matt. 27^{37} (Mark 15^{26}, Luke 23^{38}), Matt. 27^{42} (Mark 15^{32}, Luke 23^{37}). In the last solemn entry into Jerusalem it is improbable that the multitude should have greeted Him as "King" (so Luke 19^{38}), or possessor of the Davidic kingdom (so Mark 11^{10}), or "Son of David" (so Matt. 21^{9}), see p. 222. Under No. XII. it will be shown that *υἱὸς Δαυίδ* has likewise all the force of a Messianic title, so that invocations of Jesus by this name also meant the recognition of Him as the Messiah.

3. THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE NAME "MESSIAH" BY JESUS HIMSELF.

Meinhold[1] makes the statement that Jesus for His own part never desired to be "the Messiah of Israel, as the character is depicted in Old Testament prophecy and consistently therewith was expected by the contemporaries of Jesus." Of Him it should be said:[2] "He is not the Messiah, and did not desire to be so." Herein there is only this element of truth, that the position and work of the Messiah, as conceived by Jesus, greatly transcended the type predicted in the Old Testament. But any rejection of the prophetic ideal of the Messiah as understood by Jesus cannot come into serious consideration.

No weight, indeed, can be attached to Mark 9^{41}, where Jesus speaks to His disciples of benevolence shown to them *ἐν ὀνόματί μου ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ*. The words *ὅτι Χριστοῦ*

[1] *J. Meinhold*, Jesus und das Alte Testament (1896), 98 ff.
[2] Ibid. 101.

ἐστέ are here an unnecessary explanation of ἐν ὀνόματί μου which arises from לְשִׁמִי,[1] "with reference to me," "thinking upon me." Again, Matt. 23[10], where Jesus speaks of the Messiah as the καθηγητής of the disciples, cannot be made the basis of any inference in this connection, because it is probably just a duplicate of v.[8] leading up to v.[11]. It is true in fact that Jesus did not proclaim Himself to be the Messiah, nor did He wish that others should make Him known in this capacity; see Mark 1[34] (Luke 4[41]), Matt. 16[20] (Mark 8[30], Luke 9[21]), cf. Matt. 17[9] (Mark 9[9]). But it is equally certain that the Synoptic Gospels unanimously maintain that Jesus was the Messiah predicted by the prophets, not merely in the opinion of the authors, but in the belief that Jesus also shared this conviction. The grounds they had for this belief will have been none other than those presented to us in the Gospels, namely, (1) the self-designation "Son of man" chosen by Jesus, including all He had declared of his advent in majesty and especially of his kinghood; (2) His assent to the Messianic confession of Peter; (3) His own acknowledgment during the capital trial repeated before the high priest and before Pilate.

As for the first point, "Son of man" was at the time an unusual title for the Messiah, and for that reason it was chosen by Jesus that the people might not transfer to Him their own Messianic ideas. But that choice simply meant a protest against the supposition that He on His own impulse should seize the sovereignty before God should invest Him with it;[2] and against the Messianic theory[3] that had recently arisen, which required the Messiah to become through combat the liberator of Israel. But He had not the slightest opposi-

[1] Matthew with the same meaning says (10[41f.]) with more precision εἰς ὄνομα. Cf., further, *G. A. Deissmann*, Bibelstudien, 143 ff., Neue Bibelstudien, 24 ff. [Eng. tr. pp. 146 ff., 196 ff.]; and for בְּשֵׁם, *A. J. H. W. Brandt*, Theol. Tijdschrift, xxv. (1891) 585–589, whose researches *J. Böhmer* in "Das biblische 'im Namen'" (1898) has overlooked to the detriment of his subject. See also above, p. 123.

[2] Cf. above, p. 137 f.

[3] See above, p. 297.

tion to offer to the scriptural teaching about the King, who, according to Isa. 11^{1-5}, Mic. 5^{2}, Jer. 23^{5} 33^{15}, Zech. 9^{9}, should reign in righteousness over the redeemed people. He was conscious of being endowed with the Spirit of God; and this was a mark of the Messianic King, Isa. 11^{2}, as well as of the Servant of the Lord, Isa. 42^{1} 61^{1} (cf. Luke $4^{18ff.}$). He bore witness to Himself as God's only Son and Heir; such an one was the Messiah according to Ps. 2. He was assured that Ps. 110 spoke of Him (Matt. 26^{64}, Mark 14^{62}, Luke 22^{69}); and the one who is there indicated as King of Sion, is in His view the Messiah (Matt. $22^{41ff.}$, Mark $12^{35ff.}$, Luke $20^{41ff.}$). He spoke of the building of the temple (cf. Matt. 26^{61}, Mark 14^{58}) in the same sense in which the Messiah is the builder of the temple according to Zech. $6^{12.\ 13}$. He spoke of His "Kingdom,"[1] and therefore also of His Messianic rank, for "Anointed" is, of course, only another name for the "King." He described Himself as Judge of the world (Matt. 25^{31-46}), whose mere word is decisive in regard to salvation and perdition, with reference primarily to the prophecy of the "Son of man," Dan. 7, but in accord also with Isa. 11^{1-5} (cf. 2 Thess. 2^{8}).

In connection with the Messianic confession of Peter, Matthew ($16^{17f.}$) alone has added Jesus' commendation and promised recompense for Peter. But the injunction not to speak of the Messianic rank of Jesus can only signify, even in Mark and Luke, that, in view of His now impending suffering and death, a proclamation of this nature would have been out of place.

As for the acknowledgment made by Jesus before His judges, the Evangelist John (see $18^{20f.\ 34}$) appears to have had the impression from the evangelic tradition, that both before the high priest and before Pilate, Jesus had, in the first instance at least, avoided a direct answer to their question. Even Luke represents (22^{67-70}) that at any rate before the Sanhedrin Jesus set aside as fruitless their question whether

[1] See above, p. 134 f.

He were the Messiah or not, and that only to a second question He gave the answer, *ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*. According to the narrator, the judges assumed this to be an affirmative answer, as the condemnation is made to follow upon this admission; and it should not be said that, according to Luke, Jesus was unable to reply to the question whether He were *ὁ Χριστός*, with a direct affirmative.[1] For Luke by no means suggests any distinction between *ὁ Χριστός* and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, as if Jesus could more readily assent to the former than the latter. Moreover, the amplifying narrative of Luke cannot be reckoned as particularly faithful to the facts. He has omitted "blasphemy" as the ground of condemnation, and the situation is made more intelligible for his readers by tracing the condemnation of Jesus to His alleged assumption of the dignity of a Son of God. And the words of v.[67f.], which are peculiar to Luke, will also be an explanation due to the evangelist himself, the reason for their insertion being that he postponed the claim to divine Sonship to the end as being the decisive item in the trial, and was thus obliged to furnish a new introduction for the statement in regard to sitting at the right hand of God. Matthew, too, can only have meant the words used by him, *σὺ εἶπας* (26[64]), to be taken as a form of assent; since, according to his account (26[25]), Jesus gave the same answer to Judas when he asked if he were the betrayer. And again, *πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*, which serves in Matthew as a transition from *σὺ εἶπας* to the declaration about being seated at the right hand of God, imply no more, according to Matt. 11[22. 24], than that Jesus emphasises His first statement with a second of deeper significance. Since Mark (14[62]) has simply *ἐγώ εἰμι* for *σὺ εἶπας*, it is obvious that there existed a tradition to the effect that the answer of Jesus was understood to be a real affirmative.

[1] So *Meinhold*, Jesus und das Alte Testament, 98 f.; *Grätz*, Geschichte der Juden, iii. 374 f.; *Bischoff*, Ein jüdisch-deutsches Leben Jesu (1895), 38.

It must, however, be admitted that σὺ εἶπας was not in any case an ordinary form of assent, either in Old Testament Hebrew or in Greek.[1] But in the Jewish literature we are not altogether without corresponding examples. It is related, j. Kil. 32[b], that the people of Zeppori had threatened death to him who should bring news of the decease of the patriarch Juda. Bar Kappara had consequently insinuated this occurrence in figurative language, whereupon they asked: דְּמַךְ רַבִּי, "Is the Rabbi fallen asleep?" and he replied אַתּוּן אָמְרִיתּוּן, "ye say so." In similar circumstances, Koh. R. 7[11] 9[10], with the Babylonian dialect it is added: אֲנָא לָא אָמִינָא, "I do not say so." These instances recall b. Pes. 3[b], where Joshua bar Iddi announces with the same evasion the death of Kahana; and when he is then asked, "Is his soul gone to rest?" he replies: אֲנָא לָא קָאמִינָא, "I do not say so." He dislikes to be the bearer of so sad news. Still it is confessedly only the context that gives its peculiar meaning to "ye say so" in the case of Bar Kappara. The context for the utterance of Jesus is not of the same kind; no one will conclude from the evangelic narrative that Jesus meant to lay stress on the idea that it was merely a mode of speech on the part of the judge to call Him "Messiah," while He Himself would not have used the word. Hence Thayer[2] has rightly maintained that this instance is inapplicable as a parallel to the σὺ εἶπας of Jesus.

But another Jewish illustration of the idiom is to be found in Tosephta, Kelim, Bab. k. i. 6. The narrative there proceeds: "Simeon the modest declared before Rabbi Eliezer (*c.* 100 A.D.), 'I went forward into the temple to the part between the porch and the altar without (previously) washing

[1] *Guillemard*, Hebraisms in the Greek Testament, 56, conjectures a Græcism without being able to cite one instance in support.

[2] *H. Thayer*, σὺ εἶπας, σὺ λέγεις, in the Answers of Christ, Journ. Bibl. Bibl. Lit. xiii. (1894) 40–46. According to Thayer, σὺ εἶπας is equivalent to, "It is thy perverseness that is expressed in thy question, although I cannot resist it."

my hands and feet.' The other replied, 'Who is the more honourable, thou or the high priest' (who, in Eliezer's opinion, dared not have done so)? As he held his peace, Eliezer continued, 'Thou certainly doest well to be ashamed to say that even the high priest's dog is more honourable than thou?' Then Simeon spoke, saying, 'Rabbi, thou hast said it' (רַבִּי אָמַרְתָּ). Eliezer answered, '(I swear) by the temple service (הָעֲבוֹדָה), even a high priest (had he dared to do such a thing) would have had his head split with clubs; whatever did you do that the doorkeeper did not catch you?'" Here אָמַרְתָּ means exactly "you are right." The expression obviously is not, strictly speaking, a form of affirmation, but rather of concession.

"Thou art right" is also the meaning of *σὺ εἶπας* from the lips of Jesus. It was an assent, but in a form which showed that Jesus attached but little importance to this statement. He was, truly enough, the Messiah. But beyond that He signified that even then He was about to receive a position in which it would no longer be possible to oppose any doubt to His Messianic dignity, and in which even the divine power would be at His disposal for overcoming all His enemies. The idea last expressed in particular is not to be separated from *σὺ εἶπας*. It is a Jewish habit due to great familiarity with the Bible, to give sometimes only partial citations in the expectation that the reader or hearer will himself supply what remains, which may perhaps contain the most important point involved. In this case Jesus doubtless wished to suggest to His hearers the whole second half of Ps. 110[1], namely, "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Thereby Jesus reminded His earthly judges of the heavenly tribunal whose authority should thenceforward maintain His cause against every opposition, and assuredly bring Him once more into the world to assume His Messianic throne.

The high priest's question can be represented in Aramaic

by: אַתְּ מְשִׁיחָא or simply אֲמַר לַנָּא [2]אִין אַתְּ מְשִׁיחָא,[1] and as no interrogative particle is used, the utterance could the more directly be assented to by the words of Jesus: אַתְּ אֲמַרְתְּ. πλήν in Matthew and δέ in Luke imply no more than ו = "and" in the mouth of Jesus, because in such cases Aramaic does not use a special term for "but." And λέγω ὑμῖν, which appears in Matthew only, may be omitted. Thus the other part of Jesus' reply would be: [3]וּמִבְּעַן [4]תְּחָזוֹן לְבַר [5]אֱנָשָׁא יָתֵב מִן יַמִּינָא דְגְבוּרְתָא וְאָתֵי עַל עֲנָנֵי [6]שְׁמַיָּא.

Again, it is merely a verbal change in this expression that occurs in the vision of Stephen, Acts 7^{56}, who saw the Son of man "standing" at the right hand of God. There is, of course, no thought of a "rising up" after being seated. A Jewish parallel, though less strongly marked, is afforded in what is said of the seven classes of the pious in the future world. At the close of the reading, as given by Buber, Midr. Ps. 16^{11}, we find: "which (of the seven classes) is the highest and most excellent? It is that which stands at the right hand of the Holy One, blessed be He (שֶׁעוֹמֶדֶת עַל יְמִינוֹ שֶׁל הקב"ה), as it is written, Zech. 4^{3} 'one upon the right side of the bowl,' and Ps. 16^{11} 'at thy right hand pleasures for evermore.'" To this are then appended the sayings of two Amoraim whose names are not given. The second of them names as the highest class of the righteous in blessedness, according to Midrash on the Psalms (ed. Constantinople, 1512), "the teachers of the Bible, and those who faithfully instruct children, because they are destined to sit under the

[1] No decision need here be sought in regard to the form of adjuration used by the judge to Jesus, which Matthew alone gives. It was not, at least, a case in which the law of Moses and of the Rabbis would have empowered a court of justice to put the defendant upon oath. The Abbés *Lémann*, who in "Valeur de l'Assemblée qui prononça la peine de mort contre Jésus-Christ," [3]1881, enumerate the points in which the trial of Jesus was at variance with rabbinic law, have overlooked this instance.

[2] Bibl. Aram. הֵן, Targ. אִם.

[3] Galil. וּמִן כְּדוֹן.

[4] Galil. תְּחָמוֹן.

[5] Galil. לְבַר נָשָׁא.

[6] In the Jerusalem Gospel, Matt. 26^{64}, is: את אמרת ברין די אמר לכון דמן כדו תחמון לברה דברנשא יתיב מן ימינא דחילא ואתי על ענניהון דשמיא.

protection of the Holy One, blessed be He!" but according to Vay. R. 30, "those teachers of the Bible and Mishna who faithfully instruct children, because they are destined to stand at the right hand of the Holy One, blessed be He!" (לַעֲמוֹד בִּימִינוֹ שֶׁל הקב"ה).

To Pilate's question: *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;* the three Synoptists give as the reply of Jesus, *σὺ λέγεις* (Matt. 27^{11}, Mark 15^{2}, Luke 23^{3}). According to Thayer (loc. cit. 43), these words were meant by Jesus as a question, implying "sayest *thou* this, whose duty it is to do better than to make thyself the mouthpiece of my enemies?" or else "sayest thou this of thyself?" as in John 18^{34}. But even in John the answer of Jesus to Pilate's question: *οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ;* is *σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι.* A Greek would at least have put *σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις;* for "sayest thou this?" but not *σὺ λέγεις.* But the real sense intended here also will rather be that of an admission. To this extent Jesus meets the question of His judge; any further communication He refuses by being silent. Clearly enough by His demeanour before the judges, Jewish and heathen, Jesus wished to give no occasion for the opinion that in the last moments He had any wavering thoughts in Himself, and therefore He did not deny that He was the Messianic King of Israel. At the same time, it had to be made known that He was not minded in presence of such a tribunal to offer any sort of justification. Consequently it was as the Messiah of Israel, though not in the sense in which many Jews imagined him, that Jesus went to death. By reason of the acknowledgment made by Him, the Jews mocked Him as "Messiah" (Matt. 26^{68}, Mark 15^{32}, Luke $23^{35.\ 39}$), the heathen as "King of the Jews" (Mark $15^{9.\ 12.\ 18}$, Matt. 27^{29}, Luke 23^{37}), although in the Synoptists these appellations are not distributed on this ground to the two classes. According to the superscription on the Cross, He was put to death as "King of the Jews," *i.e.* in Aramaic, מַלְכָּא דִיהוּדָאֵי (Matt. 27^{37}, Mark 15^{26}, Luke

23^{38}), and certainly not because He had been falsely so considered.

There is, therefore, no doubt that Jesus solemnly acknowledged as His own that position which prophecy ascribes to the Messiah of Israel. He affirmed His Jewish kingship before Pilate, and thereby supplied the latter with the legal basis for His condemnation; and before the Sanhedrin He gave to His Messianic confession such a form as offered them a pretext for delivering Him up to death according to Jewish law. The assertion of a Messianic rank could not, indeed, in itself have straightway led to a death-sentence for Jesus. The procedure to be followed in such a case may be seen from a legend related in b. Sanh. 93^{b}: "Bar Koziba held sway for two years and a half. When he said to the Rabbis 'I am Messiah,' they answered him, 'It is written of the Messiah that he discerns and judges,[1] let us see whether he can do so.' When they perceived that this was beyond his power, they then put him to death." A verdict such as we are dealing with would therefore not result from any stipulation of law, but from the duty of a law court to take precautions according to circumstances for the well-being of the people, even by inflicting an exceptional sentence of death. A mere claim to the Messianic title would never have been construed as "blasphemy." Holtzmann[2] would censure certain Protestant exegetes, naming Schanz on Matt. 26, according to whom this did take place in the trial of Jesus. But he thereby evinces merely his own ignorance of Jewish legal processes. By the heathen judge Jesus was condemned as a usurper of royalty; by the Jewish tribunal, because He claimed for Himself an exalted position such as had not been assigned even to the Messiah.[3] His judges

[1] *I.e.* he can determine who is right or wrong without inquiry.

[2] Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 265 f.

[3] The Similitudes of Enoch, which speak of the Son of man as Jesus does, although of Jewish origin, do not represent a view in any sense general. Moreover, it was one thing that any person should merely represent such a theory,

understood and were bound to understand His reference to the Son of man sitting at the right hand of God, which Jesus, according to Ps. 110^1, had applied to Himself, in the proper sense of the words, and not as a mere simile such as might have been used of every king of Israel, as in 1 Chron. 28^5 29^{23}.[1] It was this that the high priest pronounced a case of blasphemy; and he considered any further presentation of evidence as superfluous, because the capital offence had even then been perpetrated in presence of the whole court. There is thus no justification for Bleby's[2] complaint that Jesus was illegally condemned solely on His own admission without the hearing of witnesses. The proceedings were not in fact so informal. The judges considered themselves in this case to be sufficient witnesses of the criminal offence. But it is clear that their interpretation of the Mosaic law on blasphemy (Num. 15^{30}) was less formally developed than the later rabbinic law (Sanh. vii. 5), which made a death-sentence for blasphemy almost impossible.[3]

It was not in consequence of a mere misunderstanding of an expression used by Him that Jesus was condemned to death. The thoughts He entertained of Ps. 110^1 are indicated by His question to the scribes, Matt. 22^{45} (Mark 12^{37}, Luke 20^{44}). He whom David called "Lord" was no mere man. The right to judge the world was assumed by Jesus

and another very different if there really was one who said that the theory was realised in himself. Cf. my treatise "Christianity and Judaism" (1901), 63.

[1] "And Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father."

[2] H. W. Bleby, The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth considered as a judicial act (1880), 31.

[3] On the Jewish conception of the Mosaic law on blasphemy, see "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 44–49. I am wrong in saying there, p. 46 f., that according to Siphre on Deut. 21^{22} (ed. Friedm. 114^b) every one is a "blasphemer" who puts forth his hand against a fundamental article of the law. What is stated is merely that the blasphemer belongs to the class of capital offenders. And in Siphre, ed. Friedm. 33^a, j. Sanh. 25^b, b. Kerit. 7^b, the verse Num. 15^{30} is explained as meaning that every wilful sin deprives God of something, and is therefore blasphemy. But all this does not prove that Jesus could *according to rabbinical law* have been condemned as a blasphemer. But cf. b. Sanh. 61^a.

when He forgave sins (Matt. 9[6], Mark 2[10], Luke 5[24]), an act which was also regarded as blasphemous. He claimed to be a new lawgiver, Matt. 5[21–48], and that in a manner which Jewish feeling regarded as an invasion of the divine prerogative; for, unlike Moses, who spoke in the name of God, He announced in His own name what should henceforward be regarded as law. His miracles were done not through prayer, still less by muttering spells with the names of God, angels, and demons, but by bidding the lame to walk (Matt. 9[6], Mark 2[10], Luke 5[24]), the deaf ear to hear (Mark 7[34]), the leprous to be clean (Matt. 8[3], Mark 1[41], Luke 5[13]), the dead to arise (Mark 5[41], Luke 8[54]; Luke 7[14]), the storm to be still (Matt. 8[26], Mark 4[39], Luke 8[24]). To follow Him is of more consequence than even parental duties (Matt. 8[22], Luke 9[60]; Matt. 10[37], Luke 14[26]); on one's relation to Him depends eternal weal and woe (Matt. 10[32], Luke 12[8f.]; Matt. 16[24ff.], Mark 8[34ff.], Luke 9[23ff.]). He held Himself to be exempt from the payment of the temple tax because His was not a subject's position (Matt. 17[26]); He entered into the temple as a Master (Matt. 21[12f.], Mark 11[15ff.], Luke 19[45f.]). Clothed in divine Majesty, He will in time return again (Matt. 24[30f.], Mark 13[26f.], Luke 21[27f.]). And in full agreement with this position comes the declaration of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. He was the Messiah and desired to be so, but in a sense which appeared blasphemous to the narrow horizon of contemporary Judaism.

It is a question of a more formal nature to what extent Jesus reckoned His earthly work, including His sufferings and death, as forming part of the Messianic vocation. That the time of His royal sovereignty was then anticipated by Him, implies also that the real Messianic status—which is but another name for kingship—belonged to the future. The Messianic confession of Peter will certainly be meant proleptically, as he certainly did not see the Messianic sovereignty of Jesus actually realised at the time; and even

the question of the high priest really inquired whether Jesus believed Himself destined to become the Messiah. Despite the fact that the proper Messianic position of Jesus belonged to the future, it was not therefore disallowed to call Him "Messiah" in advance. Even the Rabbis of a later date have no hesitation in calling the Messiah by this name before His appearance as such. But a profound difference between the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah and the position of Jesus requires to be insisted on. Judaism is indifferent as to how the prior life of the Messiah may be passed, because his conduct, active and passive, during this time has nothing to do with the Messianic rôle. In the case of Jesus, the time before the entrance upon the sovereignty is organically bound up with the period of Kingship. The future ruler is at the same time He who, teaching, suffering, and dying, paved the way for the coming, not so much of His own sovereignty, as for that of God. Thus the picture of Israel's Messiah transforms itself into that of the Redeemer of mankind.

XII. THE SON OF DAVID.

1. THE JEWISH IDEA OF MESSIAH'S DAVIDIC ORIGIN.

Every Israelite held it for certain that the promise of an eternal sovereignty had been given to the house of David (see 2 Sam. 7^{16}). This promise forms the background of the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. Even on occasions when no necessity was felt to speak of a Messiah, the recollection of that promise was warmly cherished (see Sir. 47^{11}, 1 Macc. 2^{57}). It is true that it was found possible to apprehend it as in reality given to the people whose head was the Davidic king, and to apply it to the future of the people when it had pleased God to manifest that king, Isa. 55^{3}, Ps. 2. 89;[1] but this resulted

[1] See above, p. 268.

ultimately in supplying fresh sustenance to the Messianic hope, properly so called. In Ps. Sol. 17^{23} we find for the first time *υἱὸς Δαυίδ* as a title of the Messiah, where the designation is probably dependent upon such scriptural expressions as בֵּן, יֶלֶד, "son, child," Isa. 9^{5} [1] (Targ. רַבִּי, בַּר); שֹׁרֶשׁ יִשַׁי, "the root of Jesse," Isa. 11^{10} (Targ. בַּר בְּרֵיהּ דְּיִשַׁי, "son of the son of Jesse"); צֶמַח, "branch" (*i.e.* of David), Jer. 23^{5} 33^{15}; cf. Zech. 3^{8} 6^{12}; perhaps also זַרְעֲךָ, "thy seed (David's)," 2 Sam. 7^{12} (Targ. בָּרָךְ, "thy son").[2] Thereafter בֶּן דָּוִד is frequent in Jewish literature as a title of the Messiah, especially in the phrase "the son of David comes" (בֶּן דָּוִד בָּא). The first representatives of the expression are Gamaliel II. (*c.* 110 A.D.), b. Sanh. 97^{a};[3] Yose ben Kisma (*c.* 120), b. Sanh. 98^{a};[4] Yokhanan ben Torta (*c.* 130), j. Taan. 68^{d};[5] Juda ben Ilai and Nechemya (*c.* 150), b. Sanh. 97^{a};[6] others of later date are named b. Sanh. 38^{a}, $98^{a.\,b}$; b. Erub. 43^{b}; b. Yoma 10^{a}; cf. j. Sukk. 55^{b}. The "Branch of David" (צֶמַח דָּוִד) is spoken of in the Babylonian recension of the Eighteen Benedictions in the petition concerning the Messiah; but the Palestinian form of that prayer and the Blessing at meals[7] do not go beyond mentioning the "sovereignty of the house of David" (מַלְכוּת בֵּית דָּוִד). The short form of the Eighteen Benedictions, beginning הֲבִיאֵנוּ, also speaks only in general terms of the restoration of the Davidic royalty.[8] The Targum to the prophets, which applies the prophecies of Isa. 9. 11, Mic. 5,

[1] The Messianic interpretation of Isa. $9^{5.\,6}$, though represented by the Targum, does not seem to have been general. The Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament have no trace of it. Sometimes the passage was connected with Hezekiah, of whom Justin says the Jews understood the prophecy regarding Immanuel, Isa. 7^{14} and Ps. 110; see Dial. c. Trypho, 33, 43, 67, 68, 71, 77, 83.

[2] Messianic application of 2 Sam. 7^{12} is attested for the contemporary Jews by Justin, Dial. c. Trypho, 68. That the builder of the temple alluded to in that verse might well be the Messiah, see Zech. $6^{12.\,13}$, Targ. Isa. 53^{5}.

[3] Cf. *Bacher*, Agada d. Tann. i. 97.

[4] Ibid. i. 402. [5] Ibid. ii. 557. [6] Ibid. 222, 236.

[7] See b. Ber. 48^{b}, where Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (*c.* 120) already enjoins the mention of מַלְכוּת בֵּית דָּוִד in the Blessing at meals.

[8] This applies specially to the Babyl. recension; cf. "Mess. Texte," $7^{a.\,b}$.

Jer. 23. 33, to the Messiah, calls the Messiah in Hos. 3^5 by the name מְשִׁיחָא בַּר דָּוִד; while the Targum on Canticles and also the Jerusalem Targums have adopted the later distinction between a מְשִׁיחַ בַּר דָּוִד and a מְשִׁיחַ בַּר אֶפְרַיִם (see Targ. Cant. 4^5 7^4, Targ. Jerus. I. Ex. 40^{9-11}, Targ. Jerus. on Zech. 12^{10}).[1] In this duplicate form it is noteworthy that the more recent type of Messiah Ben Ephraim or Messiah Ben Joseph postulates the descent of the Messiah thus entitled from Ephraim or Joseph, and that the character in view is not merely a Messianic representative of the ten tribes.[2] Messianic hopes were associated also with the person of David himself, as shown above, p. 301. On the whole, it must be considered the general conviction, that the Messiah had to be a descendant of David, just as even the author of the Philosophoumena, ix. 30, represents to have been the Jewish expectation.

Though such was the case, it does not follow that, in speaking of the Messiah, his derivation from David should have been expressly mentioned or insisted upon. The prophet Zechariah already quotes the words of Jer. 23^5 without including the Davidic descent. In the same way this element is omitted in Enoch 83–90, Bar. Apoc. $40^{72f.}$, 2 [4] Esdr. $12^{32ff.}$[3] The omission is most conspicuous in the Similitudes of Enoch (chaps. 37–71) and in 2 [4] Esdr. 13, where the Messiah, represented as in God's keeping, can hardly be a son of David, although Isa. 11, Pss. 72. 89 are used in delineating the picture of the Messiah. The authors have therefore considered it possible that the prophecy in regard to the Branch of David should be fulfilled through a person who did not spring from the lineage of David. But for this, as for other reasons, their view cannot be regarded as one which was widely diffused among the Jewish people.

[1] See "Aramäische Dialektproben," 12.

[2] So still *W. Bousset*, Der Antichrist (1895), 65; see, however, "Der leid. u. der sterb. Messias, 6, 16, 20.

[3] Only the Syriac version, 2 Esdr. 2^{12}, mentions the Davidic descent.

2. THE DAVIDIC DESCENT OF JESUS.

By His question how the Lord of David can also be his son, Matt. 22[45] (Mark 12[37], Luke 20[44]), Jesus showed that a Davidic descent, according to the flesh, was not an essential attribute of the Messiah. It follows, consequently, that it was in no sense the question of derivation from David that caused Him to turn to the subject of the Messiah. Apart from this, it is in full accord with His whole conception of Messiah's position[1] that God alone could call any one to that dignity. For Him there was no question of vindicating a claim to the kingly heritage. For all this it need not be inferred that Jesus was not a descendant of David.

The Gospels relate that Jesus was sometimes greeted with the cry *υἱὲ Δαυείδ*, Matt. 9[27] 15[22] 20[30f.] (Mark 10[47f.], Luke 18[38f.]). According to Matt. 12[23], the people expressed the conjecture that He might be *ὁ υἱὸς Δαυείδ*, and Matt. 21[9. 15] (cf. Mark 11[10]) they even rendered homage to Him under this name. The last instance has been reckoned unhistorical, as is shown on p. 222. With respect to the other passages, it has to be noted that, in calling Jesus *υἱὸς Δαυείδ*, they virtually appealed to Him as "Messiah." Now it is certain that this Messianic title would not have been ascribed to Him had it been believed that He did not satisfy the genealogical conditions implied by the name. Positive testimonies to the Davidic descent of Jesus are offered in the genealogies, Matt. 1[1–17]; cf. v.[20], Luke 3[23–38]; cf. in the narrative, Luke 1[27. 32. 69] 2[4], Acts 13[23], besides the statements of Paul, Rom. 1[3], 2 Tim. 2[8], and the Apocalypse, 5[5] 22[16]. The descent from David is attested by the evangelists with regard to Joseph only, and not Mary, in accordance with the view that descent on the mother's side does not carry with it any right of succession, and that her husband's recognition of Mary's supernatural child conferred upon it the legal rights

[1] See above, p. 266.

of his son. Lichtenstein[1] recalls the fact in this connection that all property acquired by a spouse becomes uniformly the possession of the husband according to Keth. vi. 1, and that in the case of any question as to one's origin, common opinion was, in point of law, the decisive consideration, b. Kidd. 80ª. Nevertheless, neither of these points touches the right of succession. The criterion for this, according to Bab. bathr. viii. 6, is whether the father is willing to recognise any one as his son. A case such as that of Jesus was, of course, not anticipated by the law; but if no other human fatherhood was alleged, then the child must have been regarded as bestowed by God upon the house of Joseph, for a betrothed woman, according to Israelitish law, already occupied the same status as a wife. The divine will, in the case of this birth, conferred upon the child its own right of succession, which, once Joseph recognised it, would not have been disputed even by a Jewish judge.

The fact that the genealogies given by Matthew and Luke for Joseph are discordant, shows, indeed, that not all the names contained in them are reliable, but proves nothing against the genuine Davidic descent of Joseph. A family might, of course, be recognised as Davidic, and be really descended from David, even although it did not possess satisfactory genealogies to prove this. The most convincing evidence that the Holy Family was really possessed of Davidic descent is that of Paul. As the scribes held to the opinion that the Messiah must be a descendant of David, it is certain that the opponents of Jesus would make the most of any knowledge they could procure, showing that Jesus certainly or probably did not fulfil this condition. And there can be no doubt that Paul, as a persecutor of the Christians, would be well instructed in regard to this point. As he, after mingling freely with members of the Holy Family in Jerusalem, shows that he entertained no sort of doubt on this point, it must be

[1] Hebrew commentary on Mark and Luke (1896), 13ª f.

assumed that no objection to it was known to him. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find a single trace of conscious refutation of Jewish attacks, based on the idea that the derivation of Jesus from David was defective. The proper conclusion, therefore, is to maintain, with Paul, the Davidic descent of Jesus, although the continuity of the divine revelation in the Old and New Testaments does not depend upon it.

There is, moreover, nothing very improbable in the fact that families known to be Davidic should have existed in the time of Jesus. Little stress, of course, can be laid on the pretensions to Davidic descent advanced by the Jewish families of Abarbanel and Yakhya in Spain.[1] Nor can we trust much to the pedigrees which trace the family of the princes of the captivity in Babylon back to David. Five discordant genealogies of this sort are known,[2] the most ancient among them being given in Seder Olam Zota,[3] which dates perhaps from the ninth century. But despite the worthlessness of these data, it may be concluded that at least Huna (*c.* 200 A.D.), the chief of the exiles, was really reckoned to be a descendant of David. This, indeed, is not proved by the Baraitha,[4] known even to Origen,[5] which found a fulfilment of Gen. 49^{10} in the fact that the chief of the exiles in Babylon had a recognised legal authority, and that the patriarchs of Palestine possessed a faculty of teaching approved by the State. From this at most could be inferred

[1] See *I. da Costa*, Israel en de Volken[2] (1873), 510.

[2] These genealogies are reviewed by *F. Lazarus*, Die Häupter der Vertriebenen. Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der Exilsfürsten in Babylonien (1890), 171.

[3] For this, see *Zunz*, Gottesdienstl. Vorträge,[2] 142–147; editions of the text in *F. Lazarus*, op. cit. 158–170; *A. Neubauer*, Mediæval Jewish Chronicles, ii. 68–88; *Schechter* in Jüd. Monatsschr. xxxix. (1894) 23 ff.

[4] b. Hor. 11^{b}; b. Sanh. 5^{a}. The same view of Gen. 49^{10} forms the foundation of the statement of the sons of Khiyya, who roused the wrath of Juda I. by declaring to him in their intoxication that the chieftainship of the exile in Babylon and of the patriarchate in Palestine would have to cease before the son of David could come; see b. Sanh. 38^{a}.

[5] See *Origenes*, De princip. iv. 3, where he gives as the Jewish belief: *τὸν ἐθνάρχην ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰούδα γένους τυγχάνοντα ἄρχειν τοῦ λαοῦ, οὐκ ἐκλειφόντων τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἧς φαντάζονται Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίας.*

merely the belief in a descent from the tribe of Judah. And Juda I. says of his contemporary Huna, merely that on the father's side he was descended from Judah.[1] But if Juda I. was reckoned a son of David in the judgment of Rab of Babylon (*c.* 220),[2] while Juda himself, on a previous occasion, called himself only a descendant on his mother's side of Judah, one might suppose that he really thought of Davidic descent in his own case, as in that of Huna. The same inference is supported by the fact that Huna was a kinsman of Khiyya, j. Kil. 32^b, who was likewise considered to be a descendant of David.

In regard to the paternal descent of Juda I., he declared himself to be of the tribe of Benjamin; and thus, therefore, Paul,[3] being also from the tribe of Benjamin, was of kindred descent with his teacher Gamaliel, the ancestor of Juda. A family register[4] found in Jerusalem derived Hillel, a progenitor of Juda,[5] from David, and Khiyya from Shephatiah, son of David and Abital; whereas, according to b. Keth. 62^b, Juda springs directly from this son of David, while Khiyya is traced to Shimei, a brother of David (2 Sam. 21^{21}). This representation admits of being reconciled with the statement of Juda himself in this fashion, that either Hillel himself was descended from David on the mother's side, or else that the patriarchs were only maternal descendants from Hillel; the latter being quite possible, because the connection between Hillel and Gamaliel I. cannot be definitely exhibited.[6] Further, Hillel and Khiyya belonged by birth to Babylon, so that all these traditions of Davidic origin point to a region where particular certainty was attributed to family traditions.

[1] j. Kil. 32^b; j. Keth. 35^a; Ber. R. 33. [2] b. Sabb. 56^a.
[3] Rom. 11^1. [4] See above, p. 5. [5] See b. Hor. 11^b.
[6] The view of Theodoret is exceptional, Dial. adv. Eutychianum, i., Orthod.: Universum Davidis genus extinctum est. Quis enim novit hodie aliquem qui de Davidica radice descenderit?—Eran.: Qui ergo dicuntur Judæorum patriarchæ non sunt ex cognatione Davidica?—Orthod.: Minime.—Eran.: Sed undenam derivantur?—Orthod.: Ex Herode alienigena qui ex patre quidem erat Ascalonites, ex matre autem Idumæus. This has rightly been pronounced incredible by *J. Morinus*, Exercit. Eccles. et Bibl. ii. 259.

From all this it need not, of course, be concluded that Khiyya, Juda I., and Huna were certainly descendants of David; but it is obvious that about 200 A.D. there were several families to which the tradition of Davidic descent still clung.[1]

The last sure notice of the descendants of David is seen in 1 Chron. 3 (*c.* 300 B.C.), which traces the descent down to seven generations after the Exile, thus proving the existence of sons of David for the period about 300 B.C. From a still later period may possibly arise the mention of the Davidic house in Zech. $12^{7.\,8.\,10.\,12.\,13}$. It is worthy of note that Luke traces the descent of Joseph from Nathan the son of David, while Zech. 12^{10} mentions a house of Nathan alongside of the house of David; whence it has been conjectured that the former is meant to be regarded as a branch of the family of David. And hence also the Pseudo-philonic Breviarium Temporum[2] will not have been altogether without some historical basis in giving a line of Davidic princes (duces) reaching to the Hasmonæans. There seems, in fact, to have once been a Davidic family at the head of post-exilic Israel, although we have no precise information about it.

At all events the Book of Chronicles, which gives (1 Chron. 17) the promise of 2 Sam. 7, revived afresh the idea of the royal destiny of the family of David, and thereby contributed to the preservation of the household traditions of descendants of David. Where, in addition to proud recollections, national hopes of the greatest moment were bound up with a particular lineage, those belonging to it would be as unlikely to forget their origin as in our own days, for instance, the numerous descendants of Muhammed,

[1] It is, however, too much to say that "princely descent was attributed to every school president," as stated after Weber by *Holtzmann*, Lehrb. d. neutest. Theol. i. 245.

[2] Too much importance is ascribed to this document by *L. Herzfeld*, Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael (1847), 378–387; *F. Lazarus*, Die Häupter der Vertriebenen, 56 f.; *J. Lichtenstein* on Luke 3^{23}.

or the peasant families of Norway who are descended from ancient kings. Hence it results that no serious doubts need be opposed to the idea of a trustworthy tradition of Davidic descent in the family of Joseph.

XIII. "THE LORD" AS A DESIGNATION OF JESUS.

1. THE JEWISH USE OF THE TERM.

The application of אָדוֹן and אֲדֹנָי in the Hebrew of the Old Testament is discussed in my treatise "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 16 ff., 21 f. The biblical Aramaic uses only מָרֵא for "lord." In Dan. 4^{16} the king is addressed as מָרְאִי (*kerē* מָרִי). The Targum of Onkelos is also acquainted with this term, but makes use of it only to replace בַּעַל or אִישׁ, signifying the owner or possessor of anything; cf. *e.g.* Gen. 37^{19}, Ex. 21^{29}; אָדוֹן, on the other hand, always appears in Onkelos as רִבּוֹן. The feminine form רִבּוֹנָה[1] is also found; see Gen. 16^{8} רִבּוֹנְתִי, "my mistress." Only in the designation of God as אֲדֹנֵי הָאֲדֹנִים, Deut. 10^{17}, do we find מָרֵי מַלְכִין as we have it also in Dan. 2^{47}. The form of address, אֲדֹנִי, is always רִבּוֹנִי when it refers to one person, *e.g.* Gen. 23^{11}; and when it refers to several, רִבּוֹנָנָא, as Gen. 23^{6}. For אֲדֹנָי pointed so as to refer to God, we find only the usual abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton.[2] The Targumic mode of using רִבּוֹן is recalled in Mark 10^{51}, John 20^{16}, by the term addressed to Jesus, *ῥαββουνεί*[3] (another reading *ῥαββονί*, D Mark *ῥαββεί*, John *ῥαββωνεί*), and also by the strange

[1] For "mistress" the Targum to the Prophets puts מָרָה; see Isa. 24^{2} מָרְתָהּ, "her mistress."

[2] See "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 24.

[3] In the time of Jesus רִבּוֹן had not yet become רִבּוֹן. The interchange of *u* and *o* in pronunciation can also be seen in other cases; see Gramm. des j.-pal. Aram. 140; *Cl. Könneke*, Behandl. d. hebr. Namen in der Septuaginta (Stargarder Programm), 23; *Σουσάννα*, Luke 8^{3}, for שׁוֹשַׁנָּה, and the Palmyrenian Ἰακούβος for the name יַעֲקֹב.

reading, רבונכן for רבכן, "your teacher," in the fragments of the Tractate Keritot (better Kārētōt) of the Babylonian Talmud,[1] which have recently been published by S. Schechter and S. Singer. Otherwise it is a remarkable fact that in the early Jewish literature, apart from the Targums, רִבּוֹן is scarcely ever used except as referring to God, often especially in the title רִבּוֹנֵיהּ דְּעָלְמָא; see, *e.g.*, j. Taan. 68[d], Hebr. רִבּוֹנוֹ שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם; see, *e.g.*, Taan. iii. 8; Mechilt. 56[a].[2] The biblical אָדוֹן, referring to a man, is once rendered by רִבּוֹן, Ber. R. 93; but this is due to the influence of the Targum. In j. Meg. 75[c], רִבּוֹנֵיהֶם are the "masters" of slaves. With these exceptions, the usual name for a human master, conjointly with רַב or רַבָּן, to be discussed under No. XIV., is only מָרֵא, מָר. The "lord" of a slave is called מָרֵיהּ, j. Gitt. 46[a]. For the phrases, "if thou art lord of thy soul (passion)," "if thy soul is thy mistress," we find in j. Ab. z. 44[d], אִין אַתְּ מָרֵיהּ דְּנַפְשָׁךְ and אִין נַפְשָׁךְ מָרָתָךְ. But even the owner of a pearl is called מָרֵיהּ, "its lord," j. Bab. m. 8[c]; and the creditor is said to be מָרֵי חוֹבָא, "lord of debt," j. Taan. 66[c]. The layman addresses the learned man as מָרִי, "my lord," j. Keth. 28[d]; but the learned man also says מָרִי as a form of courtesy to the professional man, j. Kil. 32[a]; Ab. d. R. Nathan, 25; and a maid-servant uses the same term of her master, Vay. R. 24. David is called מָרִי by Abigail, j. Sanh. 20[b]; King Yannai by Simeon ben Shetach, j. Naz. 54[b]; and the Roman emperor gets the same name from Turnus Rufus, b. Sanh. 65[b]. The proper style of address to the King of Israel, according to Tos. Sanh. iv. 4, was אֲדֹנֵינוּ וְרַבֵּינוּ. Moses is also addressed by Joshua as "lord," Ass. Mos. 11[4. 9. 19]. The Targum, 2 Kings 5[13], reproduces אָבִי of the text by מָרִי in the appeal to Naaman. According to b. Makk. 24[a], b. Keth. 103[b], King Jehoshaphat greeted every learned man with the words: רַבִּי רַבִּי מָרִי מָרִי.[3] The title to be used in speaking to the Messiah, according to

[1] Talmudical Fragments in the Bodleian Library (Cambridge, 1896), 5, 29 f.
[2] See also above, p. 173 f.
[3] See Rabbinovicz on b. Makk. 24[a].

b. Sanh. 98ᵃ (ed. Venice, 1520), is רַבִּי וּמוֹרִי, which should be read as רַבִּי וּמָרִי,[1] "my master and lord." "My lord high priest," מָרִי כָּהֲנָא רַבָּא, is the real form at the root of the peculiar address to the high priest: אִישִׁי כֹּהֵן גָּדוֹל, Yoma iv. 1, in which the intention probably was to avoid אֲדֹנִי; cf. אֲדֹנִי, הַכֹּהֵן, "my lord priest," Ber. R. 71. Considering also that מָרִי can likewise be used in speaking of and to God, as shown on p. 180 f., we conclude that this is a term of deferential homage, the scope of which can vary widely, according to the position of the person addressed.

When a person so esteemed is spoken *about*, the same form of language can be used. But, in that case, the pronominal suffix is as indispensable as in the case of אָדוֹן in the Old Testament.[2] To speak of "the Lord" with no suffix is contrary to Palestinian usage. If the speaker includes others along with himself, who owe a similar deference to the superior named, then the form to use is מָרָן, "our lord," as Abigail says when speaking of King Saul, j. Sanh. 20ᵇ. Again, in a narrative with a Palestinian colouring, b. Ab. z. 11ᵇ, Esau as the ancestor of Rome is called by the Roman herald מָרָנָא. Similarly we find in Aramaic inscriptions מראנא, "our lord," CIS, ii. 1. 201, 205 (Nabatæan); מרהון, "their lord," de Vogüé, 28 (Palmyr.), said of a king; and מראי, "my lord," CIS, ii. 1. 144 (Egyptian). In Babylon only was it customary to use מָר without suffix, even without the definite ending, of an exalted person supposed to be well known. Even with regard to the Messiah this form has been used, b. Sanh. 98ᵃ.

It is improbable that the Greek *κύριος* had been adopted into the language of the people at an early period.[3] Only the most recent Targums have occasionally קירים for "lord"; see Jerus. I. Num. 11[26]; Targ. Ps. 53[1], Job 5[2]. The other

[1] The Munich MS. has, however, only רַבִּי.

[2] "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 21 f.; Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 78.

[3] Formerly I had considered an early date possible; see "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 81, 84.

Targums all ignore it. As part of Greek sentences, it occurs, b. Ab. z. 11[b] and j. Shebu. 34[d] (j. Ned. 38[a]). According to Ber. R. 89, it was known that קִירִי (*κύριε*) meant "lord" (אָדוֹן), whereas כִּירִי (*χείριε*) meant "slave" (עֶבֶד). It was in Babylon considered likely enough, according to b. Chull. 139[b], that certain Palestinian doves uttered the sound קִירִי קִירִי, *κύριε κύριε*; and in b. Erub. 53[b]—if בירי be corrected into כירי—we hear of a story told in Babylon about a Galilean woman who contrived to address a heathen judge with the words מָרִי כִירֵי, "my lord slave" (*χείριε* for *κύριε*). But the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash give no sign of so intimate a blending of the languages. Among uneducated Jews living in Greek surroundings such a thing might possibly occur. But in the absence of proof such a condition must not be relegated to the time of Jesus.

2. THE USAGE IN THE SYNOPTISTS.

In Matthew and Luke, Jesus is often addressed as *κύριε*, not only by the disciples but also by others, especially such as appealed for His help. Mark has this form of address only once (7[28]); but in general this evangelist shows reticence in recording such forms of address. Speaking to the disciples, Jesus refers to Himself as *ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν*, Matt. 24[42]. It is further to be noted that parallel passages sometimes have not the same word as the title of address. For *κύριε*, Matt. 8[25], we find in Luke 8[24] *ἐπιστάτα*, and in Mark 4[38] *διδάσκαλε*. The *κύριε* of Matt. 17[4] is replaced in Luke 9[33] again by *ἐπιστάτα*, and in Mark 9[5] by *ῥαββεί*. Mark 9[17], Luke 9[38] have *διδάσκαλε* for *κύριε* in Matt. 17[15]. *ῥαββουνί* occurs in Mark 10[51] for *κύριε* in Matt. 20[31. 33] (Luke 18[41]). And while Jesus in giving instructions to His disciples about the entry into Jerusalem, Matt. 21[3] (Mark 11[3], Luke 19[31]), implies that they were in the habit of speaking about Him as *ὁ κύριος*, He bids them, in the charge to make ready for

the Passover, refer to Himself as ὁ διδάσκαλος, Matt. 26[18] (Mark 14[14], Luke 22[11]). But despite this uncertainty in the tradition, it is impossible, with Resch in his דִּבְרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ, to trace every instance of κύριε addressed to Jesus back to διδάσκαλε or ῥαββεί. The Palestinian Jewish literature also recognises the two styles of address, מָרִי and רַבִּי.[1] The most natural supposition, therefore, is that both should be found in the case of Jesus. The designation of Jesus as ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, which was afterwards current in the Christian community, must, of course, be explained as a continuation of the language of the disciples. In Aramaic, according to 1 Cor. 16[22], Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 10, this title was *μαρανα* or *μαραν*, *i.e.* מָרָנָא or מָרָן.[2] The disciples must therefore have often addressed Jesus as מָרִי, and other contemporaries will have done the same. "Our Lord," מָרָנָא, is, however, to be assumed for κύριε, where several persons are represented as speaking in common, as, *e.g.*, Matt. 8[25] 20[33]. In these cases the Peshita, true to the instinct of the Syriac language, correctly writes מרן.

When the disciples spoke about Jesus, it cannot be supposed, despite the occurrence of the simple ὁ κύριος, Matt. 21[3] (Mark 11[3], Luke 19[31. 34]), Luke 24[34], that they used מָרָא with no suffix. As in the Jewish usage, just exhibited, so also in this case we should expect only מָרָנָא or מָרָן. And thence it follows that Luke's frequent use of ὁ κύριος in his narrative when speaking about Jesus (7[13] 10[1] 11[39] 12[42] 13[15] 17[5. 6] 18[6] 19[8] 22[31. 61]), would have to be altered into the same form, in order to agree with Aramaic idiom. And the appellation ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς (Luke 24[3]) cannot be imagined other than מָרָנָא יֵשׁוּעַ in the mouth of a Palestinian Christian.

Special mention may be made of Matt. 22[45] (Mark 12[37],

[1] *A. Wünsche's* remark, Neue Beiträge z. Erläut. de Evangelien, 278, that in Palestine רַב had the same meaning as מָר in Babylon, is incorrect.

[2] See Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Ar. 120, 162, 297. מָרָנָא is the older, fuller form.

Luke 20[44]), *εἰ οὖν Δαυεὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν*; as any one might perhaps hold that in the question of Jesus the word *κύριος* was meant as a predicate of Deity. The Peshita, indeed, appears to have really taken it in this sense, as it renders *κύριον* by מריא; and in support of such interpretation it can be pointed out that for the time in question, the distinction between the sacred and the secular אדני, by pointing אֲדֹנָי for the former and אֲדֹנִי for the latter, was not yet completely established,[1] so that it was possible to apprehend the unpointed אדני in Ps. 110[1] as a divine epithet. But such an interpretation of Ps. 110[1] cannot be imputed to Jesus. And further, מָר without a suffix is inadmissible in the Aramaic original. Our Lord's words (as in Mark) will therefore have been: [2] אֵיכְדֵין אָמְרִין סָפְרַיָּא דִּמְשִׁיחָא בְּרֵיהּ דְּדָוִד: וְהָא אֲמַר דָּוִד בְּרוּחָא דְקֻדְשָׁא נְאֻם יְהוָה לַאדֹנִי שֵׁב לִימִינִי עַד אָשִׁית אֹיְבֶיךָ הֲדֹם לְרַגְלֶיךָ [3] (אֲמַר יְיָ לְמָרִי תִּיב מִן יַמִּינִי עַד דַּאֲשַׁוִּי בַּעֲלֵי דְבָבָךְ כְּבְשָׁא לְרַגְלָךְ) אִין דָּוִד קָרֵא לֵיהּ אֲדֹנִי (מָרִי) [2] אֵיכְדֵין הוּא בְּרֵיהּ.

At first the title מָרִי, מָרְנָא, used in speaking to and of Jesus, was no more than the respectful designation of the Teacher on the part of the disciples. As soon as Jesus had entered into His state of kingly majesty, it became among His followers an acknowledgment of sovereignty; and when they addressed Him as the Son of God, then "our Lord," as applied to Jesus, was not widely separated from the same designation for God. But it must here be remembered that the Aramaic-speaking Jews did not, save exceptionally, designate God as "Lord"; [4] so that in the "Hebraist" section of the Jewish Christians the expression "our Lord" was used in reference to Jesus only, and would be quite free from ambiguity.

Among the Hellenists the case was different; for they had, and frequently used, the term *κύριος* as a designation

[1] Cf. "Der Gottesname Adonaj," 16 ff.

[2] Galilean חֵיהּ.

[3] In Onkelos also נְאֻם is reproduced by אֲמַר, see Gen. 22[16]; cf. also Targ. Ps. 110[1].

[4] See above, p. 179.

for God. The reason for always attaching a possessive pronoun to κύριος when applied to Jesus would to them be unapparent. So in this case also they said ὁ κύριος only; and it might thus often be difficult to determine whether Jesus or God were meant.

With regard to the sense attached by the primitive Church to κύριος when applied to Jesus, an influence of some importance was doubtless exercised by the fact that ὁ κύριος, "dominus," was also the title of the Roman emperor. Augustus and Tiberius had declined to accept this title. But afterwards it became common enough, and was, moreover associated with the divine honours paid even to living emperors. The simple ὁ κύριος is applied to Trajan, Äg. Urk. d. Kgl. Mus. z. Berl. 115, 562; to Hadrian, ibid. 121, 420; to Antoninus Pius, 111, 472; to Agrippa I., Waddingt. 2211. The form ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν also appears afterwards; see Äg. Urk. 12 (Commodus), 266 (Severus), 618 (Marc. Aurel.), Waddingt. 2070*e* (?), 2114 (Severus). And still more recent is ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν, ibid. 1916 (Justinian), 2187 (Julian). Severus is styled "Dominus noster sanctissimus," Corp. Inscr. Lat. viii. 7062. Suetonius (Dom. 13)[1] says that Domitian ordered the procurators to use the written formula: "Dominus et Deus noster hoc fieri jubet." Aurelius Victor (De Cæsar. xxxix. 4) relates of Diocletian: "Se primus omnium, Caligulam post Domitianumque, Dominum palam dici passus et adorari se appellarique uti Deum." Even the formula: "edictum Domini Deique nostri," was possible; see Martial, v. 8. In general, however, it was merely κύριος or else θεός[2] that was prefixed to the name of the emperor. In the Acts (25[26]), Festus speaks of Nero as ὁ κύριος. When the Christians called Jesus ὁ κύριος, they will have meant that He is the true "divine Lord," in opposition to the "God and Lord" on the imperial throne of Rome. Luke's frequent use of ὁ κύριος is certainly intended in this sense. The phrase

[1] Cf. *Aurel. Victor*, De Cæsar. xi. 2. [2] See above, p. 273.

Χριστὸς κύριος used in his Gospel, 2^{11} (cf. Acts 2^{36}), defines the term *Χριστός* in this sense for the reader.

On the Jewish side there could not be an altogether similar development of language in regard to the Messiah, because they did not venture to ascribe to the Messiah a position alongside of God. But there was something akin in their emphatic affirmation that every Israelite has daily to take upon himself the "sovereignty of heaven," while he acknowledges the one God.[1] This formed a conscious protest, continually repeated, against the claims to divinity advanced by the "government," which the Jews readily identified with the "sovereignty of arrogance" (מַלְכוּת הַזָּדוֹן) or of "godlessness" (מ' הָרִשְׁעָה).

XIV. "MASTER" AS A DESIGNATION OF JESUS.

1. THE JEWISH USE OF THE TERM.

It is unnecessary to give proofs that רַבִּי was the usual form of address with which the learned were greeted. For the time of Jesus its use is expressly attested in Matt. 23^{7}.

The official deliverance of the Gaonim, Sherira and Hai (*c.* 1000 A.D.), concerning rabbinic titles has been the source of much confusion. According to Aruch, *sub verbo* אבי, their verdict was as follows: "The earliest generations, who were very exalted, required no rabbinic title, neither רַבָּן nor רַבִּי nor רַב, and there was no difference in respect of this usage between Babylon and Palestine. For, take Hillel, who came from Babylon: no rabbinic title was coupled with his name. These were esteemed like the prophets, of whom it was said, 'as Haggai the prophet has said,' 'Ezra came not from Babylon'; in their case no rabbinic title is given when the name is mentioned. And, so far as we know, this custom of adding a title began with the 'princes' (the presidents of

[1] See above, p. 97.

the Sanhedrin) from the time of Rabban Gamliel the elder, and of Rabban Shimeon his son, who perished at the destruction of the second temple, and of Rabban Yokhanan ben Zakkai, who were all 'princes'; and in the same period the title 'Rabbi' began to be used among those who were duly ordained—Rabbi Zadok and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yakob, and the custom extended itself through the scholars of Rabban Yokhanan ben Zakkai. And by general consent 'Rabbi' is reckoned to be higher than 'Rab,' and 'Rabban' higher than 'Rabbi'; and still higher than 'Rabban' is the simple name; and we find none called 'Rabban' except in the number of the 'princes.' At the close of the Talmud tractate Eduyyoth, in a Tosephta there is given also the following explanation: 'He who has scholars and his scholars have likewise scholars, is called "Rabbi"; if his own scholars are forgotten, he is called "Rabban"; if both the first and the second generation of scholars are forgotten, he is called merely by his own name.' Nevertheless we find that the title רַבָּן is given only to 'princes,' Rabban Gamliel, Rabban Shimeon, Rabban Yokhanan ben Zakkai, Rabbenu ha-kadosh (Juda I.)." But this rabbinic attempt[1] to arrange the various titles in an order of merit is made to depend upon the estimate formed by successors of the personages who receive the titles, and is consequently of no historical value.

The actual condition of the rabbinical literature itself requires a different explanation. Since only Gamliel I., Shimeon ben Gamliel I., Yokhanan ben Zakkai, Gamliel II., Shimeon ben Gamliel II. are called רַבָּן, while after their time the title נָשִׂיא appears to take the place of the former designation, it may be concluded that רַבָּן was the earlier Jewish name for the head of the Jews recognised by the Roman government. In Latin his title was "patriarcha," in Greek ἐθνάρχης. In this theory the only strange circumstance is

[1] This representation is still followed by *C. Taylor*, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers[2] (1897), 27; *H. L. Strack*, Pirke Aboth,[2] 23.

that Gamliel I. and his son, who lived before the destruction of Jerusalem, should also receive the title רַבָּן, while apart from their case the magnates of that age not only do not receive this title, but no corresponding epithet at all. To meet this, however, the conjecture is allowable that in the case of Gamliel I., and of Shimeon ben Gamliel I., the title was subsequently transferred to them from their successors who did bear the name. This explanation is the more plausible because on other grounds it is impossible to be always certain whether the first or the second of the couples who bore the same name is really meant.

The fact that after the destruction of Jerusalem the actual teachers of the law other than those specified always receive the title רַבִּי, is to be explained from the custom of referring to one's own teacher literally as such,[1] and from the consideration that in the earliest collection of traditional materials in the first half of the second century, those authorities who had not still an uninterrupted succession of disciples could not possibly be spoken of as רַבִּי. In actual fact, of course, men spoke of and to the learned, using the form רַבִּי even before 70 A.D., as the Gospels themselves prove. But at that time the suffix in the form רַבִּי had not yet become so otiose as presumably it did in the third and fourth centuries. In that period it was possible even to say חַד רַבִּי, "a certain Rabbi"; see j. Sot. 24^b. Examples of רַבִּי addressed to a teacher of the law are seen in R. h. S. ii. 9; j. Peah 21^b; j. Keth. 35^a; b. Ber. 3^a; b. Taan. 20^b; b. Bab. m. 85^a; b. Sanh. 98^a; b. Makk. 24^a; see also Targ. 2 Kings 2^{12} 5^{13} 6^{21} 13^{14} (for אָבִי).

From the fact that the Gospels so frequently employ διδάσκαλε as a form of address, presupposing רַבִּי as the original, it must be inferred that even then רַב was a current

[1] Yokhanan (*c.* 250), according to b. Sanh. 100^a, said that Gehazi was punished because, in presence of the king (2 Kings 8^5), he had spoken of his teacher Elisha simply by name.

designation of a teacher. Examples to this effect are seen in Ed. i. 3; Bab. m. ii. 11; Ab. i. 6, 16; Aram. j. Kil. 32^b (רַבָּךְ, "thy teacher"); j. Bab. m. 8^d (רַבֵּיהּ, "his teacher"); j. Sanh. 25^d (רַבָּן, "our teacher," of Moses); j. Erub. 19^b (רַבְּכוֹן, "your teacher").

It must not, however, be forgotten that רַב was also capable of other applications in accordance with its literal meaning, "great." In Hebraising style רַב means the "master," as distinguished from the "slave" (עֶבֶד), Ab. i. 1; b. Taan. 25^b; Shir. R. 1^1. Any Aramaic instance of the same sort is not known to me. But in Onkelos we find רַב, plural רַבְרְבִין, substituted for נָשִׂיא, "prince," singular Gen. 3^{24}, Num. 3^{24}, Ex. 22^{27}; plural Ex. 16^{22}, Num. 7^2; and for בַּעַל, taken in the same sense, Lev. 21^4; for אַלּוּף (plur.), Ex. 15^{15}; for סָרִיס, Gen. 37^{36} 39^1; for שַׂר, sing. Gen. 39^{21} $40^{2.3}$, plur. Gen. 12^{15}, Num. 21^{19} 22^{14}; for אָב, Gen. $4^{20.21}$. A "prince of demons" is called רַבְּחוֹן דְּרוּחֲיָא, j. Shek. 49^b; a "brigand chief" is referred to as רַבִּי, b. Bab. mez. 84^a. In Palmyra the leader of a caravan is called רב שירתא, de Vogüé, 7. The proper style of the king of Israel is אֲדוֹנֵינוּ וְרַבֵּינוּ, Tosephta Sanh. iv. 4, and in this title רַבֵּינוּ is considered the equivalent of the royal title. The Samaritans addressed God Himself as רַבִּי.[1] Hence רַבִּי is a deeply-deferential form of address, the full force of which is nowise expressed by the Greek *διδάσκαλε*. "My commander" would be no more than sufficient to render the term. He who was addressed as רַבִּי is thereby acknowledged to be the superior of the speaker. To some extent the Latin "magister" corresponds, as it denotes superiors of various kinds, among others the teacher especially.

The form רַבָּן[2] is a derivative from רַב, and not as A. Geiger[3] has erroneously considered it, the plural suffix added

[1] See the rendering of ארני by רבי in the Samaritan Targ. to Genesis, and in Marka, *Heidenheim*, Bibl. Sam. iii. 5^a.

[2] A kindred form is רַבְרְבָן put by Onkelos, Gen. 40^2, for סָרִיס.

[3] *A. Geiger*, Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischna (1845), ii. 129; also Siddur Yemen, MS. Chamizer, i., has רבן throughout Ab. i.

to רַב ("our teacher"). In the Targum of Onkelos this word is sometimes used for the Hebr. שַׂר, Gen. 37[6], Ex. 18[21. 25], Deut. 20[9],[1] especially for military commander. In Ab. i. 10, רַבָּנוּת means "mastery," "lordship." As already observed, רַבָּן was the title of the Palestinian patriarchs in the second century. Later, however, רַבָּן became in Palestine a very common designation of "a teacher" generally; see j. Ter. 46[a]; j. Bab. m. 8[d] חַד רַבָּן, "a teacher (sage)." As the plural of רַב was used exclusively for the adjective "great," there was no other word available for the plural of "teacher" than רַבָּנִין; see j. Sanh. 27[d] אִלֵּין רַבָּנִין, "those teachers" (sages); j. Ber. 10[a] רַבָּנִין רַבְרְבָנַיָּא, "the great teachers"; Targ. Cant. 4[9] רַבָּנֵי סַנְהֶדְרִין, "the doctors of the Sanhedrin"; cf. רַבָּנָיְךְ, ibid. 6[5]. Pronominal suffixes are not attached to רַבָּן, except in the common form רַבָּנָן, literally, "our teachers," contracted from רַבָּנָנָא, in which, however, the suffix has lost its force; see, *e.g.*, j. Taan. 69[b], רַבָּנָן דְּטִיבֶרְיָא, "the teachers (sages) of Tiberias."

The Aramaic of Palestine prefers *ōn* to *ān* as a termination for nouns. This explains how it was that רַבּוֹן (which afterwards became רִבּוֹן) should be in use as a collateral form with רַבָּן. This form, which the Targums employ for "lord" in all its meanings, was afterwards reserved by the Jews for God alone; and hence hardly any trace[2] remains in the Jewish literature to show its former application to the teacher.

As a designation for "teacher" which would correspond to the Greek *καθηγητής*, Matt. 23[10], Wünsche[3] proposes מוֹרִי in the sense of "my teacher, my guide." But there is no immediate connection between מוֹרֶה and "guide." In b. Keth. 79[a] מוֹרֶה הוֹרָאָה means one who is authorised to give legal decisions; and in j. Sabb. 11[b], j. Shek. 47[c] מוֹרְיָנָא is the "teacher of the law," just as מַתְנְיָנָא is the "teacher of the Mishna," j. Kidd. 66[c]. The form of address, מוֹרִי, which appears frequently in the text of the Talmud as now extant,

[1] See also Targ. 2 Kings 8[21], Eccl. 5[7].

[2] See, however, above, p. 325.

[3] *Wünsche*, Neue Beiträge, 279.

cannot be regarded as original. In b. Ber. 3[a] the ed. Pesaro and ed. Venice i. have רבי ומרי, and not רבי ומורי. In b. Taan. 20[b] there is found, even in ed. Pesaro, a doubled רבי and מורי; but the Munich MS. has only רבי. Similarly, this latter MS. has in b. Sanh. 98[a] רבי for the formula רבי ומורי of ed. Venice i. In b. Makk. 24[a], b. Keth. 103[b], the true reading is רבי רבי מרי מרי. The Hebrew מוֹרֶה was in no sense a general name for teacher in that period, any more than מַלְפָּן, its Aramaic equivalent, according to Ber. R. 68, or than מַלְפָּא,[1] which might be substituted for it, as in Targ. Isa. 43[27], Ezek. 3[17].

2. THE SYNOPTIC USE OF THE TERM "MASTER."

The Aramaic רַבִּי, transliterated into Greek *ῥαββεί*, is explicitly recognised as the common form of address to Jesus, Matt. 26[25] (cf., however, v.[22] *κύριε*), 26[49] (Mark 14[45]), Mark 9[5] (but Matt. 17[4] *κύριε*; Luke 9[33] *ἐπιστάτα*). The Greek *διδάσκαλε* is attested with special frequency by Mark as an address to Jesus (4[38] 9[17. 38] 10[17. 20. 35] 12[14. 19]), while in his Gospel *κύριε* is only once used (7[28]), by the Syro-Phœnician woman.[2] The form *ἐπιστάτα*, occurring six times in Luke (5[5] 8[24. 45] 9[33. 49] 17[13]) alongside of the commoner *διδάσκαλε*, is merely a Greek synonym for the latter, and both are to be traced back to the Aramaic רַבִּי.

Jesus forbade His disciples to allow themselves to be called *ῥαββεί*, on the ground that He alone was their "Master," Matt. 23[8]. In so doing He recognised that in reference to Himself the designation was expressive of the real relation between them. The form of address, *διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ*, He, however, refused to allow (Mark 10[17f.], Luke

[1] *Levy*, Neuhebr.-Chald. Wörterbuch, has a special entry under מַלְפָּא, מַלְפָּה, "teacher." But this form, intrinsically improbable as a noun, is an infinitive in the passages cited; and the whole entry should therefore be struck out. *Jastrow* in his Dictionary recognises the infinitive, but gives it the incorrect pointing, מַלְפָּא.

[2] See, however, *ὁ κύριος*, Mark 11[3].

$18^{18f.}$).[1] This address was at variance with actual usage, and, moreover, in the mouth of the speaker it was mere insolent flattery. It is related, b. Taan. 24^b, how Eleazar of Hagronya (*c.* 340) dreamt that a voice called out to him: שְׁלָם טָב לְרַב טָב מֵרִבּוֹן טָב דְּמִטּוּבֵיהּ מִטִּיב לְעַמֵּיהּ, "Good greeting to the good Rabbi from the good Lord, who in His goodness does good to His people." Here, of course, the epithet "good master" bestowed on Eleazar is reckoned a high distinction, especially as it attributes to him the same quality as to God. The like designation was declined by Jesus, because He was unwilling that any one should thoughtlessly deal with such an epithet; and here, as always, the honour due to the Father was the first consideration with Jesus. Further, the address רַבִּי טָבָא would not lead any one to think of moral goodness. The proper translation is "kind master." The rejection of the epithet, therefore, does not mean, as is generally supposed, that God alone is morally perfect, but that in Him alone is the quality of kindness personified. When it is maintained that God is טוֹב, Ps. 25^8 34^9 135^3, it is His benevolent character that is emphasised. In this sense also Jewish literature uses טוֹב of God. The thanksgiving prescribed for use on the receipt of good news, Ber. ix. 2, is: בָּרוּךְ הַטּוֹב וְהַמֵּטִיב, "Praised be He who is kind and sends kindness!" From Shimeon ben Chalaphta (*c.* 200 A.D.) we have the saying,[2] which recalls Luke 18^{1-8}, הַצִּיפָּא נָצַח לְבִישָׁא וְכָל שֶׁכֵּן לְטוֹבוֹ שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם, "the importunate man prevails over the wicked, how much more over the All-merciful!" wherefore, it is argued, it must be considered certain that the people of Nineveh must have cried *mightily* for the mercy of God, as is said in Jonah 3^8. According to Vay. R. 6, Bar Telamyon took an oath in the synagogue "by the compassionate Lord

[1] In Matt. $19^{16ff.}$ we have no mere error in translation, but an alteration of the original text, due to doctrinal preconception.

[2] Pesikta 161^a, j. Taan. 65^b (here less apt: הַצִּיפָּא נָצַח לְבִישְׁרָא כָּל שֶׁכֵּן לְטוֹבְתוֹ שֶׁלָּעוֹלָם, "the importunate man overpowers the honest man, how much more the generosity that is in the world") ; cf. *Bacher*, Ag. d. Tann. ii. 535.

of this house" (כֵּירֵיהּ דְּהָדֵין בֵּיתָא טָבָא). In Palmyra also טָבָא וְרַחֲמָנָא, "the kind and merciful," was commonly predicated of God; see de Vogüé, 75, 77. If the word should be so understood in the case of Jesus, then there is no need to inquire in what sense Jesus disclaims sinlessness, or to imagine such a connection between the address and the expectation of the scribe, as would imply that he looked for instruction regarding "goodness" from Him who was "good."[1]

A number of persons address Jesus as *διδάσκαλε*, Mark 4^{38} 9^{38} 10^{35} 12^{14} (Matt. 22^{16}, Luke 20^{21}) 12^{19} (Matt. 22^{24}, Luke 20^{28}). This would imply the use of רַבָּנָא (רַבָּן), though for such cases it may be called the general rule that an Aramaic author would certainly *write* this form, while on the actual occasion the speaker representing himself and others might, of course, have used the form רַבִּי. The Peshita, and in general the Jerusalem Gospel also, translates *διδάσκαλε* by מלפנא, but uses רב for *διδάσκαλος* only where pronominal suffixes had to be added; for *ἐπιστάτα* in Luke, however, it always put רב with suffix, namely רבי, "my master," Luke 5^{5} 9^{33}, and רבן, "our master," Luke $8^{24.\,45}$ 9^{49} 17^{13}. This form רַבָּנָא (רַבָּן) is also to be assumed for the simple *ὁ διδάσκαλος* in discourse about Jesus, Mark 5^{35} (Luke 8^{49}), 14^{14} (Matt. 26^{18}, Luke 22^{11}). And the original of *ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν* would be רַבְּכוֹן, Matt. 9^{11} 17^{24} 23^{8}.[2]

In the sentence: *οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον*, Matt. 10^{24} (Luke 6^{40}), the term *τὸν διδάσκαλον* is to be referred to רַבֵּהּ, as in the Peshita.

Jesus forbids His disciples (Matt. 23^{8-10}) to have themselves called *ῥαββεί*, *πατήρ*, or *καθηγητής*. The first and third can refer only to Himself, "Father" only to God. It is implied that *πάτερ* and *καθηγητά* were in use as forms of address.

[1] Thus *A. Seeberg*, "Abhandlungen Alex. v. Oettingen zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag" (1898), 159.

[2] In this passage the Jerusalem Gospel has מלפניכן, the Peshita רבכן.

In regard to πάτερ, its equivalent אַבָּא in the Jewish literature is principally known as an epithet of certain persons in such a way that it appears as an element in their name.[1] Abba Chilkiyya (*c.* 50 A.D.), Abba Sha'ul, Abba Yose ben Dosithai (*c.* 150), Abba Eleazar ben Gamla (*c.* 200), Abba Mari (*c.* 320), were Palestinians with this style of designation. We never find אַבָּא as an address to a teacher. The Targum to the prophets has even set aside the reverent address אָבִי, 2 Kings 2^{12} 5^{13} 6^{21} 13^{14}, used in reference to Elijah and Elisha, and inserted, where Israelites are speaking, רַבִּי, and, when a heathen speaks, מָרִי (this in 2 Kings 5^{13}). This strange procedure may be due to the fact that the Targumist had no knowledge of אַבָּא as a form of address. Perhaps, however, the passage in b. Ber. 16^{b} has some bearing on the case. The prescription of a Baraitha is there understood in accordance with the context to imply that in naming only Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "fathers" (אָבוֹת), it is forbidden to call any one else by the name אַבָּא. What this Baraitha really implies is that these three alone should bear the honorary title of Patriarchs of Israel; and another Baraitha, recorded in the same passage (both found again together in Semach i. 12, 13), prescribes that slaves only should not receive the title אַבָּא, although this was the practice in the household of Gamliel II.[2] From the second Baraitha, however, it is evident that among the free the attribute אַבָּא was permissible. It would therefore be common enough. It may have been, however, that it was not so much a form of address as an honourable appellation added to the individual name. In Onkelos the word אַבְרֵךְ, which the people shouted before Joseph, Gen. 41^{43}, is rendered אַבָּא לְמַלְכָּא, "father of the king." The wise men of primeval

[1] It is not interchangeable with the proper name Abba, which will have originated from Abiyya; see Gramm. d. jüd.-pal. Aram. 142.

[2] j. Nidd. 49^{b} also relates that in the household of Gamliel the slaves were addressed as אַבָּא טָבִי, "father Tabi." and the female slaves as אִמָּא טָבִיתָא, "mother Tabitha."

times are called אֲבוֹת הָעוֹלָם, "the fathers of the world," Eduy. i. 4; j. Shek. 47^{b}; see also Sirach 44[1] (Hebr.).

For *καθηγητής*, Matt. 23[10], Delitzsch and Salkinson have מוֹרֶה, which, however, is inadmissible, as already indicated. Neither is the literal rendering by מדברנא of the Syriac versions admissible. As *καθηγητής* occurs here in the sense of "teacher," it is simply a Greek variation of *διδάσκαλος*. And in that case v.[10] is merely another recension of v.[8], and there is no occasion to look for an independent Aramaic term for *καθηγητής*.

The form *ῥαββουνί* (see p. 324), used in Mark 10[51], also found in John 20[16], cannot have been materially distinguished from the form of address, רַבִּי, as indicated on p. 335; and therefore John is right in interpreting it as *διδάσκαλε*. In addition to this, the context in John implies that by using this form of address, Mary desires to resume the old attitude towards the "Master" which is not permitted by Jesus; whereas the appeal of Thomas, מָרִי וֵאלָהִי[1] (20[28]), is accepted.

In this narrative of the Johannine Gospel there may be seen intimations of the important fact that the primitive community never ventured to call Jesus "our Teacher" after He had been exalted to the throne of God. The title רַבִּי, רַבָּנָא, expressing the relation of the disciple to the teacher, vanished from use; and there remained only the designation מָרִי, מָרָנָא, the servant's appropriate acknowledgment[2] of his Lord.

[1] So also Jerus. Gospel; cf. above, p. 180.

[2] See Matt. 10[24. 25], where *δοῦλος* and *κύριος*, *μαθητής* and *διδάσκαλος*, appear as correlatives.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INDEX FOR GREEK TERMS.

A

ἀββᾶ, 192.
ἀγαθός, 336.
ἀγαπητός, 277 f.
ἄγγελος, 183, 197, 209 f.
ἅγιος, 149, 202 f.
Ἀδάμ (ὁ ἔσχατος), 248.
ἀδικία, 149.
ἀζύμων, ἡμέρα τῶν, 48.
αἴρειν, 133.
αἰτεῖν, 121 f.
αἰών, 147, 154, 163 f., 171.
  αἰῶνες, 155, 163, 165.
  ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, ὁ νῦν αἰών, 147 f.
  ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστῶς πονηρός, 149.
  ὁ αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος, ὁ μέλλων, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ ἐνεστὼς ὁ ἅγιος, 149.
αἰώνιος, 156 f., 165.
Ἀκελδαμάχ, 7.
ἀλήθεια, ἐπ' ἀληθείας, 227.
ἀληθῶς, 227.
ἁμαρτάνειν, 212.
ἁμαρτία, 281.
ἀμήν, 226 ff.
ἀνάκεισθαι, 110.
ἀνακλίνεσθαι, 110 ff.
ἀνατολή, 38, 223 f.
ἀναφαίνεσθαι, 107.
ἄνδρες, 40.
ἀνήρ, 65.
ἄνθρωπος, 40, 65, 240.
  πρῶτος, δεύτερος ἄ., 247 f., 251.
ἀνιστάναι, 23.
ἄνωθεν, 219.
ἄξιος, 119 f.
ἀπέρχεσθαι, 21, 156, 158.
ἀποκαθιστάνειν, 134.
ἀποκατάστασις, 178.
ἀποκρίνεσθαι, 24, 38.
ἀπολαμβάνειν, 156, 158.
ἀπώλεια, 161.
ἀραβάρχης, ἀραβάχης, 3.
ἄρνιον, 265.
ἁρπάζειν, 142.
ἄρτον φαγεῖν, 110, 112.
ἄρχεσθαι, 26 f.
ἀρχή, 167.
ἄρχων, 174.
ἀσαρθά, 3, 6.
ἀφιέναι, 21, 173.

B

βάλλειν, 156.
βαπτίζειν, 141.
βαπτιστής, 141.
Βαρθολομαῖος, 50.
Βαρνάβας, 40 f.
βασιλεία, 95 f.
  βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν, τοῦ θεοῦ, 91 ff.
  τοῦ πατρός, 94 f.
  αὐτοῦ, 95, 133.
βασιλεύς, 163, 165, 174 f.
Βηζεθά, 7.
Βηθεσδά, 7.
Βηθζαθά, 7.
Βηθφαγή, 68.
βιάζειν, βιαστής, 47, 140.
Βοανηργές, 42, 49.
βούλεσθαι, 284.

Γ

Γαββαθᾶ, 7.
γάμοι, 118.
γέεννα, 161.
Γεθσημανεί, 8.
γενεαὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος, 165.
γεσσημανεί, 8.
γῆ, 126, 174.
  ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 213.
γησαμανεί, 8.
γίνεσθαι, 32 f., 37, 41.
γινώσκειν, 283 f., cf. 80 f.
Γολγοθᾶ, 7.

Δ

Δαυείδ, υἱὸς Δ., 316 ff.
δέειν, 213 ff.

δεῖπνον, 118.
δεσπότης, 173 f., 330.
δεῦτε, 158.
δέχεσθαι, 124 f.
διά, 123.
διαγγέλλειν, 105.
διατίθεσθαι, 134.
διδάσκαλος, 331 ff.
διδόναι, 123 f.
δόξα, 231.
δύναμις, 200 f.

Ε

Ἑβιωναῖοι, 52.
Ἑβραῖοι, 7.
ἐγγίζειν, 106.
ἐγγὺς εἶναι, 106.
ἐγείρεσθαι, 23.
ἐθνάρχης, 332.
ἔθνος, 166 f., 177.
εἶναι, 35 f., 173.
εἰπεῖν, 308 f.
εἰσέρχεσθαι, 116 f., 156, 158, 160.
εἰσπορεύεσθαι, 116.
ἐκβάλλειν, 121.
ἐκλεκτός, 119.
ἐκλελεγμένος, 276.
ἐλάχιστος, 113 ff.
ἐλεημοσύνη, 62 f.
ἐλεήμων, ἐλεῶν, 204.
ἔλεος, 46.
ἐλθεῖν, 20 f.
Ἑλληνισταί, 7.
ἐλωεί, 54.
ἔμπροσθεν, 197, 210.
ἐν τῷ, c. Inf., 33.
ἐνγράφειν, 209.
ἐντός, 145 f.
ἐνώπιον, 31, 197, 209 f., 212.
ἐξέρχεσθαι, 121, 173.
ἐπαγγελία, 103.
ἐπαγγέλλειν, 103.
ἐπέρχεσθαι, 173.
ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐπιθυμίαν, 34.
ἐπιούσιος, 46.
ἐπιστάτης, 336 ff.
ἐπουράνιος, 251.
ἔρχεσθαι, 20 f., 107, 173.
ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ, 248.
ἑτοιμάζειν, 128.
ἕτοιμος, 128.
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, 102 f., 140.
εὐαγγέλιον, 95, 102.
εὐδοκεῖν, 211, 276.
εὐδοκία, 211.
εὐθετος, 119 f.
εὐθέως, εὐθύς, 28 f.
εὐλογητός, 200.
εὐνουχίζειν, 122 f.
ἔχειν, 156.

Ζ

ζαφθανεί, 53 f.
Ζεβεδαῖος, 49 f.
ζημιοῦσθαι, 167 f.
ζητεῖν, 121 f., 124.
ζωή, 156, 158 f.
ζ. αἰώνιος, 156 ff.

Η

ἠλεί, 53 f.
ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, 165.

Θ

Θαδδαῖος, 50.
θάλασσα, 47.
θέλημα, 211.
θεός, 174 f., 194 ff.
θ. τοῦ αἰῶνος, 163.
θ. τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 174.
θησαυρίζειν, 207.
θησαυρός, 206 f.

Ι

ἰδεῖν, 108.
Ἰσκαριώθ, Ἰσκαριώτης, 40, 51 f.
ἱστάναι, 23.
ἰῶτα, 5.

Κ

καθηγητής, 335, 338.
καθαρίζειν, 62 f.
καθίζειν, 22.
καιρός, ὁ νῦν, 148 ff.
καλεῖν, 118 f.
κάμινος, 161.
Καναναῖος, 50.
καταβολή, 167.
καταλείπειν, 21 f.
καταξιοῦν, 119 f.
κερδαίνειν, 167 f.
κηρύσσειν, 102 f.
κλείειν, 121.
κλείς, 121, 215 f.
κληρονομεῖν, 125 f., 156 ff.
κληρόνομος, 115, 126 f.
κλητός, 119.
κόλασις, 161.
κόσμος, 162 ff.
ὁ κ. οὗτος, 147 ff.
κρίνειν, 173.
κτίσις, 167, 176.
κ. καινή, 178.
κυνάριον, 176.
κύριος, 163, 173 f., 179 ff. (God); 270, 303 f., 324 ff. (Christ).

Λ

λαλεῖν, 25 f., 105.
λαμᾶ, 53 f.
λαμβάνειν, 124, 156, 158.
Λεββαῖος, 50.
λέγειν, 25 f., 38, 312.
λεμά, 53 f.
λόγος, 229 ff.
λ. τῆς βασιλείας, 95, 106.
μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους, 38.

Μ

μαθητεύειν, 105 f.
Μαθθαῖος, 51.
μαρανα, 328.
μέγας, μείζων, 113 ff.
μέριμνα, μεριμνᾶν, 154 f.
μέρη, 66 f.
μέρος, 127.
μέσος, ἐν μέσῳ, 146.
Μεσσίας, 291.
μικρότερος, 113 ff.
μισθός, 46, 206 ff.
μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας, 95, 106, 165, 283.

Ν

ναί, 226 ff.
ναός, 183, 197.
νόμος, 183.
νυμφών, 116.

Ο

ὁδός, 160.
οἰκουμένη, 166, 169.
οἰκτίρμων, 204.
ὄνομα, ἐν ὀνόματι, εἰς ὄνομα, 305 f.
Ὅπλα, 7.
ὀσμή, 160.
οὐρανός, 174 f., 217 f.
ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, 206 ff., 209 f., 213 f.
εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, 212, 218.
ἐξ οὐρανῶν, 219 f.
ὀφείλημα, 281.
Ὀφλᾶς, 7.

Π

παῖς, 185, 277 f.
παλινγενησία, 177.
παράκλησις, 109 f.
παρατήρησις, 143 ff.
παραχρῆμα, 28 f.
πάσχα, 3, 42, 48.
πατήρ, 193, 339.
ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς (ὁ οὐράνιος), 184 ff.
ὁ π. μου, ὑμῶν, 190 f.
πλήν, 227, 311.
πνεῦμα, 202 f.
πορεύεσθαι, 21.
προσδέχεσθαι, 109.
προσωπολήμπτης, 30.
προσωπολημψία, 30.
πρόσωπον, 29 ff.
πύλη, 116 f.
πῦρ, 161.

Ρ

ῥαββεί, 327, 331 ff.
ῥαββουνεί, 324, 340.
ῥηθέν, 41.

Σ

σάββατα, 3.
Σαδδουκαῖοι, 3.
Σάφειν, 7.
Σεπφεραῖος, Σεφφερᾶς, 133.
Σίμων, 51.
σκῆνουν, 231.
Σκαριώθ, 40, 51 f.
σοφός, 202.
στηρίζειν, 30.
στόμα, διὰ στόματος, 38.
Συμεών, 51.
συντέλεια, 155.

Τ

τάσσειν, 119.
τέκνον, 190.
τέλος, 155.
τοιοῦτος, 127.
τροφή, 46.
τυγχάνειν, 120.

Υ

ὑμέτερος, 127.
υἱός, 115.
υἱ. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 234 ff.
υἱ. Δαυείδ, 316 ff.
υἱ. τοῦ θεοῦ, 185, 268 ff.
υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 240.
υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, 95, 115 f., 190.
υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 116.
υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, 116.
ὕψιστος, 198 f.
ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, 220 ff.
ὕψος, ἐκ ὕψους, 223 f.

Φ

φαγεῖν, 110 ff.
Φαρισαῖοι, 2.
φθάνειν, 107.
φοβεῖν, φόβον, 34 f.

Φρουραί, Φρουραία, 3.
φωνή, 204 f.
φῶς, 166, 176.

X

Χαναναῖαι, 3.
χαίρειν χαρὰν μεγάλην, 34 f.
χαρά, 117.
Χαφεναθά, 7.
χείριος, 327.
Χριστός, 270, 289 ff.
Ἰησοῦς Χ., 292, 303 f.
Χ. Κύριος, 303 f., 330 f.

Ψ

Ψυχή, 47.

Ω

ὡσαννά, 220 f.
ὠφελεῖσθαι, 45.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CITATIONS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

MATTHEW.

CHAP.	PAGES
1 1	292, 303, 319
16	292, 303
18	292, 303
20	183
24	183
1 and 2	39
3 16	203
17	204, 276 ff., 288
4 1	203
3	275
6	275
8	166
17	102, 106
18	303
23	95
5 3	127
4	126
5	224
7	224
9	199, 224
11	259, 261
12	206
14	166, 176
16	190
18	5
19	113
20	116
21 ff.	315
30	156, 158
34	206
37	228
45	190, 199
48	66, 190
6 1	190, 206
4	192
6	192
8	192
9	190
10	107
12	281
14	190
18	192
20	206

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
6 24	197
26	190
32	167, 190
33	95, 122
7 1	224
2	225
7 f.	122 ff., 224
8	125, 224
11	190
13	116 f., 161
14	156, 160 f.
21	116, 190
22 f.	260
8 3	315
11	110
12	95, 115, 121, 190
20	253, 261
22	105, 315
25	327 f.
26	315
29	199, 275, 304
9 6	213, 253, 259, 261, 315
8	254, 262
11	338
15	116, 263
27	319
35	95
10 2	303
7	104, 106
10	46
20	192, 203
22	155
23	260 f.
24	338
24 f.	340
28	233
29	192
32	259, 315
32 f.	190, 197, 210
37	315
41	306
11 2	303
5	102

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
11 9	227
11	113
12f.	47, 102, 139 ff.
18f.	261
21	201
22	308
23	201
24	308
25	174, 191
26	191, 211
27	192 f., 282 ff.
12 5ff.	262
8	261 f.
18	277
23	319
27	115
28	107, 146, 202
31f.	203, 224
32	147, 255, 261
40	261
41	64
50	190
13 11	95, 106, 283
19	95
22	148, 154
35	167
37	261
38	95, 115, 167
39f.	155
41	134, 261
42	121, 161, 261
43	95, 113, 192
45f.	122
49	155
50	121
52	105
14 2	201
33	274
15 2	112
13	190
22	319
26	189
16 13	254, 259
16	254, 260, 274, 288, 304
17	190, 254, 260
17ff.	307
19	121, 213 ff.
20	254, 303, 306
21	259
24ff.	315
25	102
26	166, 168
27	192 f., 260
28	107, 133, 227
17 4	327, 336
5	204, 276 ff.
9	306
15	327
24	338

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
17 25	281
26	315
18 1	113
3	116
7	166
8f.	116, 156, 160 f.
10	190
14	190, 211
18	213 ff.
19	190
23	64
35	190
19 4	167
6	196
8	167
12	122
14	127
16	156, 158
16f.	337
17	116, 156, 161
21	206
23f.	116
28	177, 246, 282
29	67, 102, 123, 147, 156
20 1	64
21	133, 305
23	128, 192
28	259
30f.	319
31	327
33	327 f.
21 3	327 f.
9	220 ff., 305, 319
12f.	315
15	220 ff., 319
22	125
25	219
37f.	281
38	115
43	133, 224
22 2	64, 118, 282
3f.	118
4	128
8f.	118, 128
10f.	110
13	121
14	118
16	338
21	138
24	338
30	147, 197
31	179
37	182
41ff.	285 ff., 307
43	203
44	182
45	314, 319, 328
23 7	228, 331
8	336, 338

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
23 9	338
10	306, 335, 340
12	224
13	116, 121
22	206
23	68
26	62
36	227
24 3	155
6	155
13	155
14	95, 102, 104, 155, 166, 176
21	167
22	179
30	242, 257, 315
36	193 f., 287
42	327
46	181
47	227
51	127
25 10	121
16ff.	67 f.
21	116 f.
23	116 f.
30	121
31ff.	307
34	95, 125, 128, 167, 192
46	156, 158, 161
26 13	95, 102, 104, 166, 176
17	42
18	328, 338
21	227
22	336
25	308, 336
29	95, 107, 110, 192
39	191
42	191
49	336
53	192
61	197, 307
63	200, 274, 288
64	200, 242, 251, 257, 274, 308
68	304, 312
70	81
73	80
27 11	305, 312
17	292, 303
22	292, 303
29	305, 312
34	68 f.
37	305, 312
40	197, 274, 305
42	305
43	305
46	53
51	56
54	275, 304 f.
28 19	167, 193 f., 287
20	155

MARK.

CHAP.	PAGES
1 1	288, 292, 303
10	203
1 11	204, 276 ff.
15	102, 106
34	306
38	102
39	95
41	65, 315
2 10	213, 253, 259, 261, 315
20	263
27	255, 262
28	261 f.
3 11	275, 304
14	104
17	42, 49
20	112
28	238, 240, 254
29	147
4 11	95, 106, 283
14	95
19	148
21	166
24f.	224
38	327, 336, 338
39	315
5 7	199, 275, 304
10f.	65
19	179
35	338
41	315
6 6	95
14	201
51f.	274
7 2	112
5	112
27	190
28	327
34	315
8 10	66 f.
27	254, 259
29	254, 260, 274, 304
30	254, 303, 306
31	259
34ff.	315
35	102
36	166, 168
38	192 f., 260
9 1	107, 133, 227
5	327, 336
7	204, 276 ff.
9	306
17	327, 336
34	113
38	336, 338
41	292, 305
43	116, 156
45	116, 156, 160 f.
47	116, 156, 161
10 6	167

MARK—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
10 9	196
14	127
15	116, 124
17f.	156, 336
20	336
21	206
23ff.	116
29	102, 123
30	67, 147, 156, 158
35	336, 338
37	133, 305
40	128
45	259
47f.	319
51	324, 327, 340
11 3	327 f., 336
4	68
9f.	220 ff.
10	305, 319
15ff.	315
24	125
25	189 f.
30	219
12 6f.	281
7	115
14	336, 338
17	138
19	336, 338
25	147, 197
26	179
30	182
35ff.	285 ff., 307
36	182, 203
37	314, 319, 328
43	227
13 4	155
7	155
10	95, 102, 166
13	155
19	167
20	179
26	242, 257, 315
29	106
32	193 f., 287
14 9	95, 102, 104, 166, 176
12	42
14	328, 338
18	227
25	95, 107, 110
36	191 f.
45	336
58	197, 307
61	200, 274, 288
62	200, 257, 307, 308
68	81
15 2	305, 312
9	303 f., 312
12	303 f., 312
18	305, 312

MARK—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
15 23	68 f.
26	305, 312
29	197
30	274
32	304 f., 312
34	53
39	275, 304
43	109
16 15	167, 176

LUKE.

1 2	39
6	183
9	183
11	183
27	319
32	199, 275, 319
35	199, 275, 288
38	183
66	183
69	319
76	199
78	39, 223
2 4	319
9	183
11	292, 304, 331
23f.	183
25	109
26	183, 304
28ff.	319
38	109
49	288
3 22	203 f., 276 ff.
38	288
4 3	275
5	166
9	275
24f.	227
26	64
41	275, 304, 306
43	102
44	95
5 5	336, 338
13	315
17	183
24	213, 253, 259, 261, 315
34	116
35	263
6 5	261 f.
20	127
22	259, 261
23	206
35	199
36	66, 204
37f.	224
40	338
46	228, 260
7 13	328

LUKE—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
7[14]	315
22	102
26	227
28	113
33f.	261
8[10]	95, 106, 283
11	95
16	166
18	224
24	315, 327, 336, 338
26	199, 275, 304
31f.	65
39	179
45	336, 338
49	338
54	315
9[2]	104
11	105
18	254, 259
20	254, 260, 274, 304
21	254, 303, 306
22	259
23ff.	315
24	102
25	45, 166
26	193, 260
27	107, 133, 227
33	327, 336, 338
35	204, 276 ff.
38	327
46	113
49	336, 338
58	253
60	105, 315
62	119
10[1]	328
7	45
9	104, 106
11	106
20	209
21	174, 191, 211
22	192 f., 282 ff.
25	156
27	182
37	46
41	228
11[2]	107, 192
3	46
4	281
9f.	122, 123, 224
10	125
13	189
19	115
20	107, 146
30	261
32	64
33	166
39	328
41	62

LUKE—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
11[42]	68
50	167
51	227
12[1]	54 f.
5	227, 233
6	210
8f.	197, 210, 259, 315
10	147, 224, 254
19	47
30	167, 177
31	95, 122
32	123, 134, 211
33	206
36	118
42	328
43	181
44	227
13[15]	328
22	95
24	116, 156
25	121
26	47
28	110, 121
29	47, 110
14[1]	112
8	118
11	224
14	224
15	110
16	118
24	118
26	315
35	119
15[7]	209
10	197, 209
18	212, 217
21	212, 217
16[8]	116, 147
13	197
16	47, 102, 116, 139 ff.
17	5
17[1]	166
5f.	328
13	336, 338
20f.	107, 143 ff.
18[6]	328
11	197
13	197
14	224
16	127
17	116, 124
18f.	156, 337
22	206
24f.	116
29	102, 123
30	147, 156, 158
38f.	319
41	327
19[8]	328

LUKE—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
19[11]	107
17	67
29	68
31	327 f.
34	328
38	221 f., 305
45f.	315
20[4]	219
13f.	281 f.
14	115
21	338
25	138
28	338
34f.	147
35	119
36	197
37	179
41ff.	285 ff., 307
42	182
44	314, 319, 329
21[3]	227
7	155
9	155
19	47
26	167, 173
27	242, 257, 315
31	106
22[7]	42, 48
11	328, 338
15	34
16	55

LUKE—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGES
22[18]	95, 107, 110
21	227
27	259
29f.	134 f., 282
30	133, 246
31	228, 328
42	48, 191
57	81
59	80
61	328
66	274
67ff.	307
69	200, 251, 288, 307
70	255, 274, 288
23[2]	292, 304
3	305, 312
34	191
35	274, 305, 312
37f.	305, 312
38	312
39	305, 312
42	133, 305
46	191
47	275, 304
51	109
24[3]	328
19	65
26	116
34	328
47	104, 166
49	223

Fuller expositions are given of the following:—

Matt. 3[17] (Mk. 1[11], Lk. 3[22])	276 ff.
Matt. 11[12f.] (Lk. 16[16])	139 ff.
Matt. 11[27] (Lk. 10[22])	282 ff.
Matt. 12[8] (Mk. 2[28], Lk. 6[5])	261 f.
Matt. 16[19] 18[18]	213 ff.
Matt. 17[5] (Mk. 9[7], Lk. 9[35])	276 ff.
Matt. 19[16ff.] (Mk. 10[7f.], Lk. 18[18f.])	337 f.
Matt. 21[9] (Mk. 11[9f.])	220 ff.
Matt. 22[41ff.] (Mk. 12[35ff.], Lk. 20[41ff.])	285 ff., 314, 319, 328
Matt. 26[63ff.] (Mk. 14[61ff.], Lk. 22[66ff.])	308 ff.
Matt. 27[11] (Mk. 15[2], Lk. 23[3])	312 f.
Luke 17[20f.]	143 ff.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED, EDINBURGH

RETURN TO ⟶ CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library

5064

LOAN PERIOD 1	2	3
HOME USE		
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.

Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEP 01 1989

AUTO DISC SEP 15 '88

JUN 18 1990

AUTO DISC JUN 06 1990

FORM NO. DD6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

YC 40696

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES

C006738203